THE

LABOUR MONTHLY

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

Editor: R. PALME DUTT

Volume 16 December, 1934 Number 12

THE FIGHT FOR THE UNITED FRONT

7 JOHN STREET, Theobald's Road, LONDON, W.C.1

PRICE SIXPENCE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOW READY!

THE THIRD EDITION OF

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM AND COMMUNISM

By L. RUDAS

(Completely Revised and Enlarged under the Author's personal direction)

Price **6d.** (44 pages)

RATES FOR QUANTITIES

4/6 per doz. (post free). 9/6 for 25 (post free, 10/2). 18/8 for 50 (post free 20/-)

The Labour Monthly considers that apologies are due to those who ordered copies of this edition when it was originally announced in a previous issue. After full reconsideration it was decided, however to postpone publication in order to enable the author to make very considerable additions and revisions to the original edition. In its present form therefore this most important contribution to the elucidation of Marxism-Leninism should be in the hands of every reader of the Labour Monthly and every active worker for Socialism.

ORDER NOW

The Manager, The Labour Monthly, 7 John Street, London, W.C. 1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

VOLUME 16 DECEMBER, 1934 NUMBER 12

Editor: R. PALME DUTT

CONTENTS

Our Financial Appeal - - - - - - Page 705

Notes of the Month - - - - - - - „ 711
THE FIGHT FOR THE UNITED FRONT
By R. P. D.

The Next Steps in the Fight against Fascism „ 728
By GEORGE ALLISON

Muzzling the League of Youth - - - „ 735
By JOHN GOLLAN

Councils of Action in Spain - - - - „ 739
By SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT

Agriculture and Industry in Ireland - - „ 744
By GEORGE GILMORE

Marx and Engels on the British Working Class Movement, 1879-1895, X - - - - - „ 749

Book Reviews - - - - - - - - „ 757
Towards the Misunderstanding of Marx *By* P. A. S.

Index to Volume XVI - - - - - - „ 761

Published at

7 JOHN STREET, Theobald's Road, LONDON, W.C.1.

A

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Labour Monthly

Editorial and Publishing Offices :
7 JOHN STREET, LONDON, W.C.1.
Telephone HOLBORN 6656

¶ The Editor of *The Labour Monthly* invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him or undertake to enter into correspondence regarding rejected contributions, although every endeavour will be made to return the same when a stamped and addressed envelope for that purpose is enclosed.

1934 : *Subscription Rates*
(PAID IN ADVANCE)

British Isles :

One year - 7/- Six months - 3/6

Abroad :

One year 8/- or $2.00. Six months 4/- or $1.00

American Subscription Representative :—Philip Novick, 270 Broadway, Suite 1401, New York City, U.S.A.

The Labour Monthly is also obtainable wholesale from The Workers' Bookshop, 38, Clerkenwell Green, E.C.1.

Advertisement Rates : £8 8s. od. per cover page and pro rata. £5 5s. od. per text page and pro rata (⅛th page minimum).

BOUND VOLUMES

Volume I	£5 os. od.	*Volume IX*	£1 1s. od.
Volume II	£3 3s. od.	*Volume X*	15s. od.
Volume III	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XI*	10s. 6d.
Volume IV	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XII*	10s. 6d.
Volume V	£2 2s. od.	*Volume XIII*	10s. 6d.
Volume VI	£1 10s. od.	*Volume XIV*	10s. 6d.
Volume VII	£1 10s. od.	*Volume XV*	10s. 6d.
Volume VIII	£1 1s. od.		

Loose copies of last five volumes can be exchanged for a bound volume for 4s. 6d. Single loose copies are available of almost every issue of *The Labour Monthly* since 1921.

The articles in *The Labour Monthly* are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A. as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Financial Appeal

THE totals this month reach £83 15s. 6d. for the Debt Fund, and £12 2s. 4d. for the Guarantee Fund.

The number of donors is greater this month than any previous month. We are very glad to see that overseas readers, including from South Africa, Canada, Ireland, the United States and other countries have come to the help of the LABOUR MONTHLY, and appreciate warmly the international character of this effort.

We should like to extend especial thanks to the Chopwell Local of the Communist Party, which in the conditions of hard pressed Durham has nevertheless made a donation of 5s. to the Debt Fund. They write :

> At our Party meeting last evening we discussed the Financial Appeal of the LABOUR MONTHLY. We have decided to make a donation of 5s. to the Debt Fund, as we realise that it would be a tragedy if this valuable magazine was to cease publication.

We earnestly hope that this example will be taken up by other local working-class organisations, C.P., I.L.P., local Labour Party, Co-operative or Trade Union. Comrades in these organisations ! What about raising the issue of the LABOUR MONTHLY in your organisation or taking a collection among your fellow-members ?

Another splendid example has been set by Walthamstow Y.C.L. They write :

> Your appeal has come at a time when the demand upon the pockets of the class-conscious workers are particularly heavy, but realising the importance of the LABOUR MONTHLY in the education of young Communists we have taken a collection and have much pleasure in sending you the proceeds, 8s. 6d.

More than this, and particularly important as an example to others, they have established a circulation scheme—one of the best ways of helping the LABOUR MONTHLY. They write further :

> Last month it was decided by our Y.C.L. to form a LABOUR MONTHLY group, with the double purpose of helping the LABOUR MONTHLY and our Y.C.L. fund (with the profits).
>
> Accordingly, we ordered 15 copies from you. We have disposed of these, and think we can sell another 9 copies, which we would be pleased to receive as soon as possible. We enclose payment for 24 copies, and we want a similar number of next month's issue when it comes out.
>
> Before the group was formed, the circulation in Walthamstow was about 8 copies. *How's that for a challenge to other districts ?*

Other districts—what about this challenge from Walthamstow ? The establishment of a LABOUR MONTHLY agent in every working class organisation is the key way to raise circulation and thus help the LABOUR MONTHLY.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Ruskin College student writes:

> In response to your appeal in the November LABOUR MONTHLY, I am sending you something which, although small, will be of some help. Of all the papers that I read I enjoy reading the LABOUR MONTHLY most of all. Every page is sound.

We hope that other Ruskin College students, and all working class educational institutions and groups, whose needs the LABOUR MONTHLY especially exists to serve, will come to the assistance of the LABOUR MONTHLY.

But remember! We need to reach a total of £480 for the Debt Fund and of £29 for the Guarantee Fund. There is still a big way to go. A big effort is needed from all those readers who have not yet sent.

Every smallest donation helps. But we want *every* reader to send something.

Here are some more extracts from letters accompanying donations, which we hope will stimulate others to do their part:

> I shall miss this five quid, but I should miss the L.M. a damned sight more. Good luck!

> I am enclosing cheque for £6, being Guarantee for the four quarters of 1934. It is more than I can afford, but the time has come when Socialists must consider their subscriptions in money and time from another angle. Neither "spare" time nor "spare" money gifts will bring Socialism in our time or that of our children's children.

> This month's issue is splendid. It is the best and most reasoned analysis of the case against the Labour Party's official policy on Fascism I have come across. It would indeed be a blow to the Anti-Fascist Front if the LABOUR MONTHLY had to close down for lack of funds.

The LABOUR MONTHLY has now carried on the fight for thirteen and a half years. We have no intention to let the LABOUR MONTHLY close down, now at the moment when it is most needed, when it is reaching a higher point of circulation and influence than at any time in its history, when the fight against Fascism is requiring the full strength of every organ which can play its part. But for this to be possible, more help is needed, and quickly.

R. Palme Dutt

NOW TURN TO PAGE 767

and fill up one or other (or both) of the forms you will find there. DO IT NOW!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

DEBT FUND.

	£	s.	d.
Previously acknowledged	56	13	3
Fanny Tocknell, S. Africa	0	2	6
D. Evans, Gorseinon ..	0	1	6
Mrs. F. Wood, Sheffield	0	5	0
C.F.C., Connecticut ..	1	0	0
L., Co. Cork	1	1	0
Collecting Card, per Mrs. Hieger, London, N.W.	0	8	9
W.W.S., London, E.C.4 ..	0	2	6
H.W.G., Herts.	2	0	0
"X"	5	0	0
O.A.B., London, W.1 ..	1	0	0
Epsilon, Cobham	0	2	0
E. W. Parsons, Beds. ..	0	10	0
Teacher, London, W.C.1.	0	10	0
Collecting Card, ex Rochdale Discussion Circle	0	10	0
Cape Town Sympathisers, S. Africa	4	10	0
K.M.P., Vancouver ..	1	0	0
Oxford Reader	0	9	0
Pallo, Esperantist	0	3	6
E. Shiner and G. K. Hughes, Banstead	0	2	0
L. Bird, Newcastle-under-Lyme	0	1	0
O.E. and R.P.A., London..	1	0	0
H. Hodson, nr. Blackburn..	0	0	6
J.M.H., London, S.W.15 ..	0	3	0
C. Johnson, Wellington, New Zealand	0	3	0
J. J. Christie, Banbury ..	0	2	0
P. Knights (a Loan), Fulham	1	0	0
"Norton," Shipley ..	0	3	6
D.H., London, S.W. ..	0	10	0
J.H.W.	0	2	6
Collecting Card, per Overseas Reader	0	12	0
J. A. McL., Stafford ..	0	10	0
A.K., Sheffield	0	2	0
J. McLanachan, Clydebank	0	2	6
Mrs. Mary Moorhouse-Pekkala, Helsingfors ..	1	10	0
D. Blackie, Cookham ..	0	10	0
Aberdeen Marxist Circle ..	0	2	0
Carried Forward	£82	5	0

DEBT FUND (*Continued*).

	£	s.	d.
Brought Forward	82	5	0
Chopwell Local, Communist Party	0	5	0
J. Boyes, Bristol	0	5	0
R. H. Absalom, West Kirby	0	2	0
Ruskin College Student ..	0	1	0
C. F. Gosling, London, N.12	0	2	0
W.R., Manchester.. ..	0	5	0
A.D., London, W.C.1 ..	0	2	0
Walthamstow Y.C.L. ..	0	8	6
	£83	15	6

GUARANTEE FUND.

	£	s.	d.
Previous Guarantees ..	5	18	4
Guarantees acknowledged (October)	3	7	0
(November)	1	9	0
Mrs. F. Wood, Sheffield ..	0	2	0
Caius College Socialists ..	0	2	6
Epsilon	0	1	0
P.F. & Mrs. Jordan, London	1	0	0
H. Stanford, Birmingham..	0	2	6
	£12	2	4

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A

DELEGATE CONFERENCE

ON

The United Front

AGAINST

War and Fascism

WILL BE HELD ON

JANUARY 26th, 1935

IN THE

Essex Hall, Essex St., Strand, London, W.C. 2

at 3 p.m.

All working class organisations, political parties, co-operative organisations and trade union bodies, are invited to send delegates to this Conference (Delegate fee 1/-).

The Conference will provide a forum for the discussion of the most urgent matters affecting all sections of the movement such as: The Growth of Fascism in Britain; the issue arising from the Southport Labour Party Conference decisions on War and the United Front; the lessons of Austria, Germany, France and Spain; the international United Front negotiations; and the next steps in Britain.

Full details of agenda, etc., will be announced in the January issue of the Labour Monthly.

Write for further particulars. *In particular please send in the name and address of the Secretary of the branch of any organisation to which you may belong so that the Labour Monthly can send an official invitation for the branch to be represented at the Conference.*

Address all enquiries to

The Manager, The Labour Monthly, 7 John Street, London, W.C. 1

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

International United Front and Britain—Labour Party's Rôle —British Bourgeois Orders—Wrecking Tactics—Brussels Joint Meeting—British-Dutch-Scandinavian Opposition—L.S.I. at Paris—Words and Deeds—February, 1933, Declaration and To-day—A Menacing Division—The Island Pharisees—British Illusions—Electoral Dreams —Realities—Fascism in Britain—Communism and the United Front—Communist Electoral Tactics—The New Stage— Trades Council Issue—The Turning of the Tide

BOTH in Britain and internationally we are now entering into the most critical stage of the fight for the united front. It is essential for every worker and for every Socialist to understand what is at stake in this fight. At the Brussels meeting of the representatives of the two Internationals Cachin said :

> The danger is here ; our homes are on fire ; the working class is everywhere most tragically threatened. You are Socialists ; we are Communists ; but at this moment the danger is such that we must reach an understanding.

And again :

> The question of the present hour is that we find ourselves on the very edge of the general fascisation of Europe, on the very edge of war ; that is the real question to-day.

That is the issue which overshadows every petty question, sectional interest, grievance, electoral calculation and the like in every country to-day ; by this issue the future will judge us. Every worker knows that the first essential to meet this menace is working class unity in the fight. Germany, Austria, Spain call aloud to us. The united workers of France, of Austria, of Spain, of Italy call aloud to us. What is holding up unity still two years after the terrible lesson of Germany ? The workers will demand a reckoning of every leader who stands in the way. It is in this situation that the Communist International has launched its direct appeal to the Second International

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the united front. The November meeting of the Executive of the Second International in Paris has revealed a sharp division among the leadership and the parties of the Second International. A profound transformation is developing among the social democratic workers, consequent on the eye-opening experience of Fascism. The overwhelming demand of the workers for unity has drawn a whole series of the social democratic parties into the united front. But the right wing section of the leadership in the Second International still maintains an obstinate resistance. As the leader and organiser of this resistance is revealed the British Labour Party. By this opposition a terrible responsibility is thrown on the British working class. *By this opposition the British Labour Party leadership is opening the gates to Fascism and War throughout the world.* We must awaken the whole British working class movement to this situation.

SEVEN years ago Lansbury, to-day leader of the Labour Party, declared :

> I want to work both with J. R. Clynes and with Harry Pollitt ; I believe both are straight loyal good comrades ; they are in thorough disagreement as to methods and as to fundamentals. . . . Yet what is there to divide these two fighters or me from either ? (George Lansbury in *Lansbury's Labour Weekly*, May 7, 1927.)

That was seven years ago. To-day Lansbury, as leader of the Labour Party, is menacing with expulsion every worker who dares to enter on a common committee or speak on a common platform with Communists, even for such an object as the relief of victims of Fascism. *What has changed in these seven years ?* Has Pollitt become any the less a " straight loyal good comrade," or wavered one inch or one iota in the working class fight ? Has the situation changed, or the need of the united front become any less urgent ? On the contrary, it is obvious to all that it has become a hundred times more urgent to-day, in the face of the menace of Fascism, that all sections should stand together against the common danger. Why, then, in the moment of the danger of Fascism, to intensify the war against Communism, to refuse the outstretched hands of the Communists and thus divide the working class ? Why in this hour

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of greatest need of unity to turn the guns of the Executive, not against Fascism, but against every local united front conference and local united committee which the will of the workers to unity, correctly responsive to the urgent needs of the situation, is setting up? How is it possible that Lansbury and his colleagues, who learnt their socialism and entered into the movement at the feet of a Tom Mann, can to-day couple Tom Mann with Blackshirt thugs as equal enemies of the working class? Is there not something indescribably shameful in this? Is it not obvious to every serious Labour Party member and trade unionist that there is something profoundly wrong in this whole line? Is it worth while at this price to win the applause of the capitalists—and to destroy the working class movement?

WHEN the representatives of the Communist International and of the Second International met at Brussels on October 15, the *Times*, the organ of the British ruling class, was quick to scent the danger of a common working class front which would defeat all the plans of capitalism. Immediately it issued its orders to the British Labour Party to break the front. Its editorial of October 19 complained that, on the well-known principles of "democracy versus dictatorship," such a meeting should have been impossible, that "Continental Socialists" were becoming little better than Communists, and that British Labour ("*our* Socialists") should make an "unqualified stand" against them:

> The Socialists have not replied by pointing out the absurdity of allying themselves with dictators of one school of thought in order to overthrow suspected dictators of another school. . . . The Socialists raise no objection whatever in principle to an alliance between declared believers in democracy and adherents of dictatorship . . . .
>
> One certain thing is that those who join with Communists extend the Communist front. The term "united front" is only a disguise, transparently thin, as our (?) Socialists in this country, and more particularly our (?) trade union Socialists have repeatedly declared. Marxian theory has, however, spread so far that it is coming to appear that if you scratch a Continental Socialist who thought he was a democrat you will discover a Communist who is scarcely surprised to find himself in the company of dictators. *The British Labour*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Party is the strongest section of the Socialist International, and consistency with its declarations at home will require an unqualified stand for alliances only with friends of democracy. (*Times*, October 19, 1934.)

Thus the orders of the British bourgeoisie to "our Socialists."

AND now observe with what rapidity and fidelity the orders of the bourgeoisie have been carried out by the British Labour leadership. On October 24 the Labour Party Executive met. Next day the *Daily Herald* reported:

> In harmony with its previous decision which was endorsed by the annual conference of the Party at Southport, the National Executive of the Labour Party declined to enter into any "united front" discussion with the Communist Party.
>
> This decision will be the mandate of the Labour Party's representatives on the Executive Committee of the Labour and Socialist International at its meeting next month when the "united front" proposal of the Communist International is considered.

The official organ *Labour* underlined this in its November issue:

> When the Executive of the Labour and Socialist International give consideration at their meeting next month to the proposals of the Communist International for a united front against Fascism, they will have to take into account the decisive attitude of the British Labour Party. . . . There can be very little likelihood that the Executive of the L.S.I. will find itself as a body in divergence from the point of view so emphatically expressed by the British section.

THIS was an open declaration of war on the line expressed at the Brussels joint conference in October by the Chairman of the Second International, Vandervelde, and the Secretary, Adler. Vandervelde stated:

> If we could take for granted the acceptance of our sections, then I would say to you: We are with you; I personally, and also Adler, would wish for nothing better. But we know very well that if we were to do this, we would come up against lively opposition in Holland, England, the Scandinavian countries, etc.

And again:

> We must say to you to-day that we very much wish to organise this co-operation as quickly as possible, but that we would be disavowed by those we are representing and who would make very lively opposition to us.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who are "those we are representing" who would "make opposition" to the united front and thus prevent the declared "personal wish" of Vandervelde and Adler to accept the proposal of the Communist International? Is it the workers? On the contrary. In the countries where the united front is not yet realised the most ruthless and continually intensified discipline has to be employed to prevent the workers realising the united front. There is no question that in every country without exception a referendum of the workers would show an overwhelming majority for the united front. The opposition comes only from a tiny handful of the inner ruling groups in the movements of the countries concerned, who, for the sake of unity with their bourgeoisie, are ready to destroy and prevent by every means the world united front of the working class.

UNDER the leadership of the British Labour Party a bloc of opposition to the united front was actively mobilised within the Second International. It may be noted that the countries drawn into this bloc closely corresponded in the main with the bloc of countries in Europe falling within the orbit of influence of British Imperialism; the main rôles were played by Holland and the Scandinavian countries. On the day after the decision of the Labour Party Executive, the Executive of the Swedish Social Democratic Party met and declared "the most determined opposition" to any form of co-operation and joint action. Albarda, the leader of Dutch Social Democracy, threatened the possibility of a split rather than accept any decision of the Second International for the united front. Similarly the *Pravo Lidu*, the organ of Czech Social Democracy, wrote:

> We regard such an agreement as impossible in the present circumstances, when parties of the Second International are participating in the government or even have the government power in their hands.
>
> It is not true to say that the International has any right to order what our attitude to the Communists shall be. That is entirely our affair. . . . We prefer to co-operate with the Republic and with those who defend it rather than with Krosnar, whose parliamentary immunity was suspended in order that the authorities might prosecute him for serious offences against the State.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The direct connection between opposition to the united front and coalition with the bourgeoisie is here openly expressed. And for the sake of this policy the bloc of opposition to the united front is prepared, not only to split the working class in their own countries, not only to prevent the united front of the two Internationals, but even to repudiate and split the Second International itself and to deny any International whatever rather than forego the policy of coalition with their own bourgeoisie.

THE November meeting of the Executive of the Second International in Paris brought these issues to a head. But it reached no solution, and in the nature of things could reach no solution ; for these issues run deep to the roots of Social Democracy, to the basic question of forming a front with the working class or with the bourgeoisie. The protracted discussions were conducted in closed session, and at the time of writing no report is yet available. It would appear, however, that, while the practical victory was won by the right wing, a virtual deadlock was reached between the opposing tendencies. The British Labour Party and its supporters were successful in stopping further negotiations ; the search for a formula to cover up the break under one or another detail plea does not seem to have been successful ; the negotiations have apparently been abruptly broken on the grounds of disagreement between the parties of the Second International. On the other hand, the British Labour Party and its supporters were not successful in their extreme demand to break the united front in the countries where it already existed (that is, to hand over the French workers to Fascism at the very moment of the renewed Fascist offensive, when only the united front is holding back Fascism). A resolution was passed leaving the sections in the different countries free to support the united front or to oppose it without any declaration of policy on this vital issue from their International. The *legitimisation* of the united front within the different sections of the Second International was thus for the first time admitted, in place of the previous formal ban which had had to be violated by France and other countries ;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this is a measure of the increasing strength of the united front. At the same time a further resolution is stated to have been adopted by a series of countries, including France, Spain, Italy, Austria, Poland and Switzerland, expressing a hope that the international negotiations may be renewed as soon as possible. It is obvious that these decisions settle nothing ; the fight for the united front goes forward.

WHAT does this process within the Second International reveal ? It is noticeable that the parties supporting the international united front are mainly those where pressure from below has already resulted in the realisation of the united front in the countries concerned, and where the realisation of the international united front is consequently recognised as the logical and necessary next step. By this fact the correctness of the line of the Communist International in March, 1933, to carry forward the fight for the united front in the particular countries as the necessary pre-condition for the international united front is demonstrated. It will be remembered that in its Manifesto of February 19, 1933, the Second International had declared :

> The Labour and Socialist International has always been ready to negotiate with the Communist International with a view to common action as soon as this body is also ready.

How does this declaration square with the present refusal to carry on negotiations for the united front ? It will be further remembered that the Communist International in its Manifesto of March, 1933, threw doubt on the " sincerity " of this declaration of the Second International, and urged that the first step should be the formation of the united front in the particular countries. This reply was criticised at the time in some quarters on the grounds that the international negotiations should have begun at once. The event has shown that any such attempt would have only resulted in immediate breakdown and refusal from the side of the Second International, since even now, with a whole series of parties supporting the united front, the outcome is still a blank wall of refusal. But the difference to-day is that, on the basis of eighteen months' hard work for the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

united front in all countries and the completion of a series of united front agreements in a number of countries, there now exists at last a strong minority of parties supporting the united front in the Second International, and the fight for the international united front can thus go forward with some hope of ultimate success.

IT is now important to bring out sharply the glaring contradiction between the declaration of the Second International on February, 1933, that it is "always ready to negotiate with the Communist International with a view to common action as soon as this body is also ready," and the present refusal as soon as that declaration is put to the test. What does this repudiation of its own words mean? How can the British Labour Party, which accepted and was a party to the February declaration without a word of protest or criticism, now loudly proclaim its opposition in principle to any united front with Communism? Such a stand throws a very dubious light on the sincerity of the February declaration. Of two things, one. Either the Second International has completely reversed its policy since the February declaration, and now opposes the united front at the very moment when the masses of the workers are moving towards it. Or the February declaration was never intended to be taken seriously, but was only, as many social democratic leaders have openly admitted that they regard all united front proposals, a "manœuvre"—which has since led to as much confusion and embarrassment in their camp, when the Communists proceeded to take it seriously, as was created in the Disarmament Conference by the Soviet Union when it proposed disarmament. In either case the practical conclusion is the same. The fight for the united front must be carried forward in the particular countries, in the countries where there is still opposition, the number of parties in the Second International supporting the united front must be increased, the resistance of the reactionary elements must be isolated in order that we may advance to the international united front.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT is the most serious feature in the new division revealed between the two groupings in the Second International is the line along which this division runs. *The countries supporting the united front are the countries where Fascism has either conquered or where its menace is close. Where the Fascist danger is not yet seen so close, where extreme legalist conditions and illusions still prevail, there the need of the united front is still ignored and denied.* This is a most menacing line of division, implying not only a complete denial of international proletarian solidarity, but a most blind senseless suicidal trust of each movement in its own bourgeoisie, holding apart from any common struggle and hoping thus to pass through the storm unscathed, until the turn of the next sheep for slaughter comes. In Italy and Austria the united front is reached only after Fascism has already conquered ; similarly in Germany, where the united front is rapidly advancing, at present on a regional basis owing to the still incurable opposition of the Bourbons at Prague. In Spain the united front is reached barely three weeks before the final battle ; the result is the most powerful fight yet shown against Fascism, but not yet strong enough for victory ; the united front had not yet reached deep enough on a mass basis and could still be betrayed by the anarchist chiefs ; the strongest fight is achieved in Asturias, where the united front had been built up longest beforehand ; had the other provinces reached the level of Asturias, the result would have been victory. In France the direct attempted Fascist coup of February 6, which overthrew the Daladier Government and its parliamentary majority, woke up the entire working class movement to the necessity of the united front ; the resultant united front has made France the world centre of resistance to Fascism, has checked the advance of the Fascist offensive, has led to the fiasco of the Doumergue Government of National Concentration, its attempted anti-democratic transformation of the constitution and unconcealed appeal to the Fascist bands to come out on the streets, and now stands foursquare to meet the threatening renewed Fascist offensive. And this common front of the French masses against Fascism, the strongest hope in the world at the present moment for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

staying the advance of Fascism, the British Labour leadership with incredible lightheartedness and disregard of any consideration save their own immediate electoral parliamentary calculations have attempted at Paris to undermine and destroy.

IN every case the need for the united front is recognised only after the enemy's blow has been struck, or when the issues are already close and menacing. That this should happen once may be understandable. That it should happen twice is already serious. But three times, four times, five times, and that still the dwindling number of Labour movements on the old legal-democratic basis should remain blissfully hugging their supposed immunity, learning not a single lesson, taking not a single measure of elementary precaution or defence—this takes leave of all sense or reason. The supposed "democracies" of Europe have gone down one after another like ninepins. The realities of class struggle in country after country have been laid bare in blood. And still the leaders of the Labour movements in a Holland, a Sweden or an England complacently strut about, congratulating themselves that they are not as others are, that they are privileged and secure in the sunshine of bourgeois favour, drawing up the hems of their garments from contamination with the mud and the blood of the desperate struggle of the workers in the other countries, scheming and manœuvring with a thousand cunning devices how to defeat the united front, the workers' only defence. This is not a picture of bedlam. It is only a picture of the last surviving reformist working class movements before the deluge.

NOWHERE is this illusory outlook to the future more dangerous than in Britain, where the heaviest battles are destined to develop. The workers in the elections, as the municipal elections have shown, are streaming to the Labour Party. This is no contradiction to the rising spirit of struggle which has shown itself at Olympia or Hyde Park, in the rising movement for wage increases, or in the developing united front advance overriding all bans in a number of important centres, as at Manchester or Bradford. It is a part of the same

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movement. The workers are seeking to express their hatred of capitalism, their hatred of the National Government and its assistance to Fascism, their desire for a single class front, as they mass the Labour vote—in a series of London boroughs sweeping aside every other candidate and establishing one-party councils, presage (despite the contradictory form) of the future dictatorship of the proletariat, and already giving alarm to the Labour Party chiefs who propose to restore the balance and bring back the Tories by the aldermanic back-door. The Communist Party, recognising this situation and the sentiment of the workers, correctly set itself before the municipal elections to do all in its power to help forward the united working class front at the elections. Despite the Labour Party policy, programme and leadership, the elections can be utilised, and require to be utilised, as a means of mobilisation for the united class front of the workers. But woe to the workers if they put their hopes in a Labour Government, and fail to realise that their only defence and strength lies in their united class front, not merely in the paper battle of an election, but in the real struggles which await them.

THE Labour Party leaders, borne up on the tide of rising votes, ignoring all the deeper issues in front, see the future through roseate spectacles. They see themselves raised to the seats of government after a triumphant election. They see the economic crisis, as they believe, subsiding, and hope, as they hoped in 1929, to swim upon the crest of an upward movement. The war crisis may yet be postponed for a little while, meanwhile they will do their duty by armaments, and, if need be, they have already safeguarded their right, by the Southport decision, to repeat 1914. As for Fascism, they believe that Mosley, beaten back by the workers' resistance, is now in retreat. Thus all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds—provided only that they can discipline and check the left workers from making trouble, keep the Labour Party from getting mixed up with Communism, and thus maintain their respectability and fitness to govern in the eyes of the bourgeoisie.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE realities of the future will reveal a very different picture. The dreams of the capitalist conquest of the economic crisis along the old lines of normal capitalism are idle dreams. Despite the loud talk of revival, despite the present rising profits of the capitalists, there is no question of recovery for British capitalism from the chronic sickness into which it has fallen, but only of bumps and jerks along the bottom, leading to ever more desperate measures. The present boom in gilt-edged stocks, and accumulation of masses of capital vainly seeking investment, illustrate how little confidence there is in industrial revival. The ship of capitalism is driving to war as its solution. Just as the Labour Government of 1929, starting with empty and frivolous hopes, rode to catastrophe, so the next Labour Government, if it is returned, will ride to greater catastrophe. The conflicts of the class struggle will increase. As disillusionment with the Labour Government grows, the peril of Fascism grows. There are already certain ominous signs, even at the present stage of the rising electoral tide of the Labour Party ; during the past year the individual membership, which had previously been steadily rising, fell by 5,000 ; there is complaint of increasing difficulties of raising finance in the local parties ; these indications suggest that the former middle class supporters are beginning to lose faith in the Labour Party ; as this process develops, they will turn increasingly, either to unity with the revolutionary workers, or to Fascism. The soil of Fascism is disillusionment with reformism, which paralyses the stable organised workers, while driving the unstable elements to Fascism.

THE notion that Fascism is in retreat in Britain, because Mosley's fortunes show for the moment a fluctuation and weakening before the determined resistance of the workers (a united front resistance achieved in spite of the Labour Party leadership) is a dangerous self-deception. The forces that drive to Fascism in Britain lie deeper than Mosley and the Blackshirts, lie in the whole present line of social, economic, constitutional and administrative development. Why does the whole present engine of the government, the police

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the law protect the Blackshirts in the face of universal public indignation, when the constitution of a similar workers' semi-military force would immediately find the entire engine of the State turned upon it to crush it as an intolerable outrage on the elementary principles of constitutional democracy? Why does the French Government protect the armed leagues of the Fascists? For the real trend of bourgeois opinion and policy the serious observer will do well to take note of the recent processes of the law courts in relation to Mosley. Mosley openly states in court his intention to use machine-guns under certain circumstances, and that it would be "easy to get them if occasion arose." It would not be difficult to imagine the outcry which would follow a similar statement from a worker's leader. But what is the reply of British justice? The Lord Chief Justice takes Mosley under his special protection and offers to him a certificate of high approval as "a public man of no mean courage, no little candour and no little ability." The workers will note with due attention this declaration—following on the aforesaid declaration of Mosley on the use of machine guns—of the highest impartial judicial voice of the British state machine. The policy of the British bourgeoisie in relation to Fascism and their future intentions stand plain for all to see.

AGAINST this gathering menace of capitalist attack, of fascism and of war, within which whole process the return of a Labour Government will only be a stage and a contributing factor, the only defence is the united strength of the working class. Never was there such need as in the midst of the present Labour electoral sweep for the revolutionary vanguard to maintain its independent leadership at the same time as fighting for the common front. *On this readiness of the revolutionary vanguard within the widest common front depends the readiness to meet Fascism.* Let there be no misunderstanding of the twofold character of this fight, which is in reality a single fight for the interests of the working class and of the working-class struggle. The united front of the working class against Fascism must be built up. This united front cannot be built

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

up, as some Labour supporters argue, on the basis of the Labour Party ("the united front is the Labour Party"); such an imaginary "united front" of electoral-parliamentary illusion and passivity will only end in disaster. The united front must be built up as the common struggle of the reformist and revolutionary workers in every sphere of the class struggle. The relative present size of the Labour Party and of the Communist Party is absolutely irrelevant to this real basic character of the united front. The Communist Party is to-day the only alternative political leadership of the working class to the Labour Party leadership. Only the combination of these two parties in a common front (including also the Independent Labour Party which represents a temporary section of the left workers) can unite and mobilise the entire forces of the working class, and bring back to the movement the energy and fighting power of the days of the Councils of Action of 1920. The majority of the workers to-day follow the Labour Party; the revolutionary workers are in a minority. The revolutionary workers recognise this; they are prepared to enter into a common front, recognising this, and are prepared to assist also in an electoral united front which will in fact assist the Labour Party to power. But it is essential that the alternative leadership to the Labour Party leadership, for the hour when the failure of this latter shall be plain to all, must already stand sharply defined before the working class. *It is essential that, as the exposure of reformism grows, the outcome must be, not disintegration and the drift to Fascism, but advance to the necessary revolutionary policy, to Communism, while maintaining the single mass united front.* This is the only path to the defeat of Fascism and to the victory of the working class in Britain. And the realisation of this depends on the simultaneous fight for the independent programme and policy and leadership of the Communist Party, and at the same time the fight for the common front in the actual struggle.

THE new electoral tactics of the Communist Party have won support in many quarters and criticism in some, but have been often misunderstood, also by some

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supporters, as well as by critics. Where there has been misunderstanding, it has been a misunderstanding of them as an alternative to the line of independent leadership and a return to previous policies. On the contrary. The fight for the independence of the revolutionary vanguard has been fought and won in the critical years since 1928, and has been increasingly justified by the whole subsequent development and evolution of the Labour Party into a full social democratic party, leaving no freedom for revolutionary Marxist leadership within its ranks. To-day the independent mass leadership of the Communist Party, even though still limited in degree, is a fact, is a political factor, as shown in the Hunger March, in the strike movement, at Olympia and Hyde Park (the still continuing electoral weakness of the Communist Party should mislead none ; this is partly a reflection of the electoral inexperience and unskilfulness of the party, and partly a reflection of the deeply-rooted parliamentarian traditions in the British working class, the non-understanding of the rôle of a revolutionary electoral party, and the essentially two-party character of the British parliamentary system). Whatever militant struggle develops in Britain to-day develops increasingly under the direct leadership and influence of the Communist Party. September 9 was above all significant as a demonstration of this new stage in the British working-class movement. The rôle of the Labour Party leadership becomes in certain respects analogous to that of the old Liberal Party leadership a quarter of a century ago, still holding the electoral majority of the working class, but with the class struggle developing in spite of them. But the trade union basis of the Labour Party makes the vital difference to this analogy ; and it is just here that the essential importance of the united front stands out in order to make possible the combined advance of the working class.

TO-DAY the issue in the present situation has reached to a further stage. The central issue to-day is the building of the united front of the entire forces of the working class for the gathering struggle against Fascism and against war. The Communist Party is taking the lead in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain as in every country in this fight for united action of the working class. And it is only because the Communist Party has established its independent leadership that it is able to take the lead in this fight for the united struggle of the working class against Fascism and war. On the future of this fight depends the future of the working class.

THE Labour Party and Trades Union Congress leadership are driving forward their counter-offensive against the united front. Southport was the counter-offensive to the united front. The Executive meeting of October 24—answering the Brussels joint meeting of October 15 and the declarations of Vandervelde and Adler in support of the united front in principle—was the counter-offensive to the united front. The rôle of the Labour Party delegation at Paris on November 15 was the counter-offensive to the united front. The Black Circular of the Trades Union Congress General Council, adopted at the meeting of October 24, to drive democratically elected militant delegates off the Trades Councils, is the counter-offensive to the united front. The fight is on. At the present moment the Trades Council issue expresses in principle the whole fight for the united front. Trades Council after Trades Council has already rejected the Black Circular. Two major Trade Unions have rejected it. Victory is possible, if all forces of the organised workers are mobilised to resist this attack. Such victory will mean the opening of a new era in the working class movement.

THE Spanish workers in the Central Prison of Madrid, socialist, communist, anarchist and non-party, have addressed a common letter to the workers of other countries. In that letter they call for the aid of the international working class, for "united front action" of the workers of all countries. In that letter they declare:

> Comrades! the only guarantee of victory is the realisation of the united front of the workers and peasants of every tendency, the ever closer alliance of all the exploited.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That is the message of the Spanish workers who have fought and suffered to the workers of every country. We must not fail the Spanish workers. We must not fail the workers of all lands. We must not fail the workers of Britain. The fight for the united front must be fought and won, if the whole movement is not to go down in disintegration and defeat. The entire united working class movements of country after country in Europe are with us and wishing us godspeed in the fight against the reactionary machine which is throttling equally their efforts towards the international united front. Let us make the present stage of the issue, the fight for the united trades councils against the reactionary splitting circular, the turning-point to the victory of the united front all along the line. The fight for the united front in Britain is the key fight for the international united front, and a heavy responsibility rests on the workers in Britain.

R. P. D.

R. PALME DUTT

contributes an article on

"The British Labour Party Conference at Southport"

to the current *Communist International.* (No. 22).

This number also includes a special supplement consisting of an article entitled "The Problems of the International Trade Union Movement." being the full text of a speech by O. Piatnitsky, Secretary to the E.C.C.I., given before a special session of members of the Red International of Labour Unions. Other articles include a section of Discussion articles for the forthcoming Seventh Congress of the Communist International; also "Marxism in the Service of British Imperialism," being a detailed review of "Why War?" by E. Wilkinson and E. Conze.

Threepence (post free) from any Workers Bookshop or direct from 38 Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C.1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEXT STEPS IN THE FIGHT AGAINST FASCISM

By GEORGE ALLISON

BEGINNING with Olympia in June the period since then has seen what may be termed the first round of mass actions against fascism, as represented by Sir Oswald Mosley and the B.U.F. All over the country, in big industrial centres like Manchester, Liverpool, Sheffield, Newcastle, etc., powerful hostile demonstrations came mainly as a result of the Olympia exposure. Even in the countryside, at Worthing, Banbury and such places the B.U.F. met with a hostility that must have surprised Sir Oswald and his colleagues in command. Hyde Park on September 9 saw this movement at its height. Despite all the threats of the Government, the warning of the Press and the vigorous action of the T.U.C. and the Labour Party the united front in action was realised on a splendid scale.

Mosley was confounded, both at the strength and spirit of the counter-demonstration, and by the comparative weakness of his own mobilisation of the B.U.F. and outside support.

Running parallel with this action and extending over a longer period wide mass activity has developed against the Fascism of the National Government. The continued action against the new Unemployed Act, the pressure on the P.A.C.s, resistance to the Trenchard ban in London, and more particularly the nation-wide campaign against the Sedition Bill are expressions of the same rising spirit of struggle. Further evidence of this developing movement is afforded by the L.C.C. elections result, the intervening bye-elections and, lastly, by the sweeping defeat of reaction at the municipal poll.

If on top of this we add the numerous but very significant small strikes in industry and the powerful wage movement developing in industry (South Wales Miners, Engineers, Cotton Workers, Dockers, etc.), it is clear that the working-class movement is returning to a fresh offensive directed against the whole oppressive system of capitalism, the National Government and Mosley, the open champion of Fascism in Britain.

The National Government is pursuing its only available course on a background of economic depression and a tense international situation. War preparations go side by side with a vicious economy drive. Added

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

millions for armaments—£2,000,000 for the derelict areas. A rigorous application of the Means Test, a throttling of free speech, and the most painstaking protection for Mosley and his organised hooligans.

In the columns of the *Blackshirt* there is never any talk of defeat. When all the world knew that Mosley had suffered a series of setbacks (Olympia, the break with Rothermere, Hyde Park and Belle Vue), the *Blackshirt* hailed everything as a victory. Even September 9 was described as a "mighty Fascist triumph." But a more careful examination of the paper and the speeches of the leaders shows that the B.U.F. is searching for its proper place on the platform of reaction.

Prior to September 9 Sir Oswald's attacks on the Jews were limited to occasional outbursts in the face of hostility. Since then, however, he has developed a sustained and well prepared attack on what he describes as "organised Jewry." It reached its highest point so far in the Albert Hall on October 28, when he succeeded in working up a state of frenzy in a typically snobbish middle class audience. Mosley knows, and the Labour Movement must recognise, that there is a deep anti-semitic feeling waiting to be stirred up. Nor is it by any means confined to the upper strata of the middle class. It exists to a surprising extent in the working-class movement, and by whipping it up in every possible sphere Mosley hopes to drive a wedge into the anti-fascist front, and at the same time secure a mass basis for the B.U.F.

But more is needed from Sir Oswald by way of assurances before he can hope to win and retain the active support of the Diehard Tories and the most backward sections in society. Therefore he has made excellent use of his recent appearances in the Law Courts to assure the "Patriots" and the Constitutionalists that the B.U.F. is their standby and the guardian of the King and Constitution, ready and capable to take power and govern by force "if panic and collapse are brought about and there is a danger of the Crown and State being swept by a Communist rising." In other words, when capitalism finds it necessary to dispense with all forms of democratic government and to uphold its decadent system by brute force, Sir Oswald is prepared to step into the breach with the organised army he is now busily preparing—an army directed not only against the "Communists," but against the vast masses of the people that have no future until the bonds of monopoly capitalism are broken.

Mosley has a lot to gain by such a presentation. His appeal is directed to just that section of society that is looking for such assurances. He can base his claim to recognition on his success in developing social strife and can, he hopes, revert to a division of labour with the National Government that will put him on the best terms with big business.

Where does the leadership of the Labour Party and the T.U.C. stand in relation to this mobilisation of class forces?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Already we know that the British Labour Party is the leader of the fight against the united front in the Second International. Whereas in Europe the very intensity of the class struggle has led to unity in action against Fascism in power or to prevent it coming into power, when it is now clear as daylight that but for the united front France would to-day be in the clutches of a fascist dictatorship, the decisions of Weymouth and Southport come as a counterblast beyond the understanding of the average worker.

How is it that the leadership of the Labour Movement in Britain pays no heed to the lessons of this and other countries? An examination of their attitude towards Fascism provides a simple and clear explanation. The source of Fascism, its class character and historical development are either ignored or completely misrepresented by Labour's authorities. They would have us believe that Mosleyism is Fascism, that at best it is a foreign importation entirely unsuited to the British climate, an importation that will wither away if it is ignored. They would have us believe that there is no connection between the policy of the National Government heading for Fascism through the legal machine and that of Mosley who speaks on behalf of the same interests. To them Mosley and MacDonald are different entirely. The one a showman to be ignored, the other a statesman to be fought through ordinary parliamentary channels. It is of vital importance to note that while mass hatred against the National Government is growing on every hand, when its warmongering designs are rousing resentment and a hardening opposition, and its economy régime is being bitterly contested; just at this moment George Lansbury finds it convenient to announce that "Tories and Liberals are not *scoundrels*, but just ordinary people with whom we disagree." (Curiously enough "scoundrels" is the very word used by Vandervelde in describing the Communists when arguing against the united front recently.) A recent pronouncement of Herbert Morrison throws still more light on the position, "I do not see that that (a Labour majority in the House of Commons) should necessarily lead to panic and chaos any more relatively speaking, than the triumph of Labour in the local government of the capital city. . . . . Far better is it for us to assume that if the people elect a Labour majority, that decision, in accordance with constitutional usage, not only will, but has got to be loyally accepted." Such a statement is at once a threat and an assurance. An assurance to capitalism that there will be no occasion for panic and chaos. And in that it implies unity with capitalism, a threat that the working class will be held in restraint by a Labour Government rather than risk producing panic and chaos in the camp of the capitalist enemy.

All the signs point to a growing militancy and desire to struggle. An honest leadership would find in this an inspiration to go forward bolder

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and with more decision to win a Labour majority on the basis of a struggle for restoration of the 1931 cuts, the repeal of the Sedition Act and the Unemployment Act, work schemes for the unemployed, a shorter working day in industry, increased wages and the enforcement of safety regulations in all dangerous occupations. Instead the present leadership, immediately the prospect of a third Labour Government appears on the horizon, hastened to comfort and assure the Banks and big business that they have nothing to fear from Labour again in office.

And as a proof of their sincerity the decisions of Weymouth and Southport are followed up by the infamous Black circular which threatens Trades Councils that accept " delegates in any way connected with either *Communist* or *Fascist* organisations or any of their ancillary bodies," and urges all Trade Unions to amend their rules so as to make it constitutional for them to keep all militants out of office.

So this is the line up ; Mosley, the National Government and the employers conducting a sustained attack on working class conditions and rights ; the Labour Party and T.U.C. leadership giving fresh assurances to the class enemy and developing a new move to divide the working-class ranks.

But the leadership of the British Labour Movement realise that everything is not plain sailing for them. The drive to " purge " the movement of the Communists and the militant fighters is hanging fire simply because the vast majority of the organised working-class movement are opposed to such a policy.

The Council for Labour has had to turn a blind eye when Communists, I.L.P.'ers, Liberals, Labour Party officials, and many others appeared on a common platform against the Sedition Bill, and in anti-Fascist demonstrations. Wherever mass interest is aroused all barriers are broken down, and the instructions of the officials are worth less than the paper they are written on. Even while the splitting tactics of the leadership were being debated lower down in the ranks unity in action was being carried through successfully. On the very eve of the Labour Party Conference the united front of the workers in Manchester achieved a brilliant success against both Mosley and the National Government in the counter-demonstration at Belle Vue. Since the Labour Party Conference more solid achievements are on record. At Llanelly on November 3 over 60,000 workers were officially represented at an anti-fascist conference convened by prominent local leaders of all parties. Yet the Labour Party was not represented by a single delegate. At Bradford on November 10 the conference called by the Trades Council to discuss " The best methods of Combating Fascism " was attended by 131 delegates. The Conference rejected the Labour Party policy of toleration for Fascism and pledged itself to action against the Fascist menace.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In a conference that was keen for unity the only jarring note came from an ex-German Social Democrat whose attack on the C.P. of Germany met with a hostile reception.

Those two conferences are an indication of the feeling that exists throughout the country. In every part of industry, in the Trade Unions, the local Labour organisations, and at the street corner meetings the demand for unity is growing in volume.

There is amongst the rank and file an instinctive feeling that the issues are too vital to permit of continued division. Unity in action is seen as the key to the solution of all the immediate problems. More and more there appears to be a chasm dividing the Labour leadership with its eyes on office and the rank and file concerning itself with the fight against the hated National Government and the employers.

In the light of such a situation it may be fruitful to examine the activity on the Anti-Fascist front.

In almost every big centre the announcement that Mosley is coming is sufficient to ensure the setting up of an Anti-Fascist Committee on a united front basis. In Nottingham, Leicester, Manchester, Liverpool, etc., etc., such committees have been established and have almost invariably succeeded in carrying through effective counter-demonstrations. But nearly all of them find themselves stumped when this has been accomplished. A Nottingham comrade expresses the position very plainly in saying " now that Mosley has gone there seems to be nothing left for us to do," and other Committees in the provinces and in the London areas find themselves in a similar position. Such an attitude has much in common with the purely reformist view that sees only the fascism of Sir Oswald Mosley. Moreover, it relegates the anti-fascist front to a purely defensive position and does not countenance the urgent necessity of developing the counter-offensive against Fascism on the widest possible front. In addition there is a noticeable slowness to penetrate into the working-class organisations—the Trade Unions, Co-ops, etc.—in order to win them for continual activity against Fascism, despite the fact that the appeals for Hyde Park and Belle Vue and the Llanelly and Bradford Conferences met with a most encouraging response.

In order to ensure the steady development of the anti-fascist front it is first of all necessary to realise that a direct appeal to the lower ranks of the Labour and Trade Union Movement will always meet with success if it is accompanied by good mass activity. All the evidence shows that the basis for the development of a really powerful movement are already there, and there is also evidence enough to show that there is no time to lose. Either the movement faces up to its tasks and responsibilities immediately or the forces of reaction drive deeper into the ranks, spreading

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discord and confusion, and making the working class ineffective in the coming battles.

The success of the anti-fascist front is guaranteed only if it is built on the fight against Fascism on all its fronts. This means that it is no longer sufficient to counter-demonstrate against Mosley. To this vital necessity there must be added an intensive drive into the working-class movement with a patient explanation, in the Trade Unions particularly, of what Fascism really is. In every sphere it is necessary completely to expose the real motive behind Mosley's anti-semitic campaign.

Unless this is done with real revolutionary thoroughness, there remains a gap into which Mosley can drive with his anti-working-class propaganda and organisation.

In addition to this it is time now to develop the anti-fascist front on a full programme of struggle against Fascism in all its forms. This means that side by side with the fight against Mosley we must initiate activity against all the fascist measures of the National Government, and particularly against the united front of the B.U.F. and the police. Local actions bringing pressure to bear on the borough authorities, protest movements and petitions demanding the closing down of the B.U.F. barracks and the withdrawal of police protection are already underway in East London. Similar action must be undertaken wherever Mosley has an active base.

The Unemployment Act, the Sedition Act, the Trenchard ban and the Trades Dispute Act express in the clearest way the Fascism of the National Government. Against these and similar measures the anti-fascist front must win support for the general fight against Fascism.

The advance of the struggle against Fascism is impossible unless the fight against the T.U.C. and Labour Party leadership is directed with new and increasing energy. Every attempt to narrow the struggle or to prevent the fight against Fascism and Communism as one and the same thing must be answered with fresh successes for the united front and a repudiation of the official policy. A turning down of the Black circular is only the first step. Wherever this is done the revolutionary elements must lead the movement a step further emulating the example set by Bradford, and ensuring that every militant Trades Council becomes a stronghold for the united front against Fascism.

By this means the working class movement can take the leadership of a broad and powerful movement in an offensive against the danger of Fascism.

In such an offensive our activities would not be limited to merely recounting the horrors and brutalities of fascism in Germany, Austria and Spain, but this, accompanied by a sustained exposure of the economic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consequences of Fascism, the similarity in the policy of Hitler and the National Government and the increasing preparedness for war, will bring home to all sections that are threatened by the Fascist menace the really urgent necessity of immediate action through the united front.

With resource and initiative the existing Anti-Fascist Committee can win mass support in every area and can place upon Borough Councillors and Labour M.P.'s the responsibility of heading the resistance to the fascist measures of the National Government, as well as leading the mass action directed against Mosley.

If it is realised that the present movement is really vital, and if, above all, the splendid example of the French working class is ceaselessly explained to the organised movement of this country, there is every reason to believe that the coming months will witness a healthy development of the anti-fascist front—a development that will win hundreds of Trade Union Branches and scores of Trades Councils for the united front. Unless this is done, and done quickly, the National Government and Mosley, helped by the Labour and Trade Union leadership, will advance against a crippled working class.

Hatred of the National Government and Fascism was never higher than at present. By a correct reaction on the part of the most advanced element in the working class there is the distinct possibility not only of checking the growth of fascism here in Britain, but also of bringing the British Labour Movement into line with the parties in the Second International that have by mass pressure been compelled to enter the united front.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MUZZLING THE LEAGUE OF YOUTH

By JOHN GOLLAN

MANY reviews have been made of the Southport Conference of the Labour Party. But up to now no serious effort has been made to judge it from the standpoint of its relation to that fast-growing section of that Party—the League of Youth. To omit such a judgment would be a mistake.

The League of Youth in the course of little more than a year has grown to such an extent that it is now of more than a little significance in Labour Party circles and among young workers beyond the immediate circle of active Labour workers.

Perhaps more than any of the other working-class youth organisations, it reflects the thoughts and feelings of the ordinary young fellow and girl of the working class.

In the last year both the Guild of Youth of the I.L.P. and the Young Communist League have made strides away from the sectarian ideas and practices of the past which have prevented their growth into organisations with a mass membership. Even so, their small membership tends still to cut themselves off into little groups of revolutionaries, with a life and habits of speech which make them " different " to the average lad.

This is what makes so interesting and important the processes which are taking place in the League of Youth.

For, as the League of Youth grows, as it absorbs into its ranks new thousands of previously unorganised and politically untrained young workers, so does the Labour League of Youth put forward ideas and make demands which are highly embarrassing to the right wing leadership of the Labour Party.

The part played by branches and members of the Labour League of Youth at all recent important mass actions of the workers against Fascism —Olympia, September 9th, Belle Vue, etc.—has been remarked upon from all sides.

The resolution of the Special Conference of London Leagues of Youth is now well known. Adopted by 90 votes against 17, it was subsequently endorsed by a Quarterly Conference of the Division. This resolution expressed the uneasy feelings and suspicions of the youth concerning the attitude of the Labour leaders on the war question.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

" We do not propose to be betrayed, as were the youth in 1914," they say bluntly. They cut through the " collective peace system " talk by the direct declaration—" In no circumstances would it be to the interests of the youth of this country for the Labour Movement to support a war in defence of any capitalist state."

In defiance of the Party leaders they " demand that if there is an immediate danger of war a general strike should be immediately declared."

Since this resolution was accepted in London its substance has been endorsed by the Lancashire Division, by the Surrey Federation, and by many other sections. It was a courageous thing to do, for the comrades concerned to call a special meeting of delegates to the Southport Conference in order to explain their resolution and appeal for support.

Here the youth at the meeting unanimously decided to re-endorse their standpoint on war, and this was supported by a big number present. In the Conference itself no opportunity was given to Cyril Lacey, National Chairman of the League, to put forward the ideas of Labour Youth. The appeal " to meet the claims of youth " fell on barren ground.

On another key question, too, Comrade Lacey, League of Youth Chairman, showed the lack of confidence felt by Labour Youth towards its Party leadership.

In the debate on the Executive's motion calling for more drastic powers against members who dared to associate themselves with the " listed " organisations, Comrade Lacey referred to this proposal as " a heresy hunt taken to childish extremes " to " thwart growing Communism."

He challenged the Executive, saying, " if you are going to cut yourselves off from the Left once more, then for your own safety and integrity see that the Right is looked to with just as much caution."

He claimed to represent " not only my Divisional Party, but the views of the great League of Youth," and appealed in the name of Youth : " Give us a sufficiently clear lead. That will not be given by heresy hunts, but by a clarion call for Socialism."

Some people more concerned to score debating points than to face up to realities, or out of fear of the realities, may say that the League of Youth has never declared for the United Front.

Formally this is true, but only in a strictly formal sense.

No Divisional or National Conference of the League of Youth has passed a resolution in favour of a united front with the Communist and I.L.P. Youth.

No Divisional or National Conference has ever been allowed to discuss the issue and take a decision.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Resolutions in favour of the united front are arbitrarily removed from the Conference Agendas by, for instance, Mr. Windle, Assistant National Agent of the Labour Party, who acts for the League of Youth as its Secretary.

In votes indirectly touching on the united front, with the issues complicated by expulsion, threats and other dire penalties in store, Divisional Conferences have voted over one-third for the line of united front. However, it is a fact of the deepest significance that the sentiment in favour of militant class actions among League of Youth members is far greater than the sentiment among these same members in favour of carrying out these militant class actions in a united front with the Young Communists and Guild of Youth.

It is true that extraordinary measures have been taken to prevent Leagues of Youth from entering into united front agreements. But this is not the whole explanation. The Communist and I.L.P. Youth would be well advised to look closely into their past and present work in connection with the League of Youth to find out why it is that they have not yet won the confidence of big sections of the Labour Party Youth.

We will deal with just one other decision of the Southport Conference which deeply affects the Leagues of Youth.

The Party Executive recommended amendments in the Constitution to allow of two representatives of the League of Youth to attend the Party Conference and one a seat on the Party Executive, in both cases " ex-officio," minus voting rights. Even this scanty right has previously been persistently denied by the Party Executive. Why then, was the concession made at this stage ?

May it not be intended as a means of side-tracking the growing insistence with which Labour Youth put forward the demand for representation on the Conference and Executive of the Party, *plus the right to discuss Party policy inside the League of Youth ?*

Past experience gives Labour Youth the right of pardon for such a suspicion !

In January the League of Youth holds its Annual Conference. It will meet in circumstances of a radically altered procedure which is rousing great dissatisfaction.

The Conference will meet in three sessions. The first will discuss the report of the Advisory Committee and Resolutions upon the Constitution and Rules of the League. The second session will discuss problems of organisation—developments of the League. The third session will discuss the policy of the Party for " Peace and War." For the second session branches are permitted to forward " constructive ideas and suggestions."

C

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There will be no opportunity for the branches to send in and discuss resolutions on any questions of Labour Party policy or the working-class struggle. The only aspect of policy on which discussion will be allowed presumably is "Peace and War." But even here no provision is made for resolutions or voting.

A member of the Party Executive will give a lecture. Time will be devoted to questioning the speaker and the remainder of the session will be devoted to a discussion upon the address, following which "the speaker will close the session by a summary of the debate."

At the Southport Conference delegates accused the Party Executive of seeking to "muzzle the League of Youth." The new Conference procedure will not lessen but increase that feeling. While obviously it is deliberately designed to prevent free discussion of Party policy by the League of Youth—and there were already very many restrictions—Labour Youth will certainly show sufficient initiative and courage to break through this barrier and find the possibility of expressing its views on the main questions. So far as the Youth are concerned these are :

(*a*) To press forward the line of London's resolution as against the line of the Southport resolution on "Peace and War."

(*b*) To insist on a line of class struggle as against a line of class co-operation, showing how class action, and in particular mass anti-fascist action is the key to building the League of Youth.

(*c*) To make provision for an advance from the passive "all members should be in their trade union"—to the active line of building 100 per cent. youth trade unionism and youth sections, sports sections, etc., for the trade unionists.

(*d*) To strengthen the insistence on the right to discuss all questions of policy and to adopt a youth policy.

(*e*) To discuss the development of the youth united front and find the best ways of co-operating with other youth organisations.

In his recruiting appeals last year Arthur Henderson declared that the Labour Party did not treat its youth as "junior partners," but invited them to an "equal share" in a "great adventure." He cannot logically complain now if Labour Youth take him at his word and make up their own minds on these great issues.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COUNCILS OF ACTION IN SPAIN

By SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT

IN the early days of November, five weeks and more after the beginning of the armed revolt, three weeks and more after the beginning of the " All Quiet " bulletins of the Government, the Red Army of Asturias burst out of the mountains south of Oviedo, invaded the city, took possession of the arsenal, removed eleven thousand rifles and everything else that might serve a useful purpose, took the time to attempt, unsuccessfully, to blow the arsenal to smithereens with dynamite, and returned to the mountains.

At about the same time Lerroux chatted to journalists in Madrid. He was trying to put over a press statement which would cut the ground from under those sections of the extreme Right and the Army High Command who were claiming that only something in the nature of a military coup d'etat could master the revolution. For they knew, and Lerroux knew, and almost everyone—except those relying for their news on the British bourgeois press—knew that the " complete destruction of the revolutionary movement " was a fiction for public consumption only.

So Lerroux, whose big business supporters precisely for this reason dared not give ground before an open military coup d'etat which would call forth, they calculated, a smashing answer from the revolutionary workers, put him up to speak as follows : He said that the revolution really was mastered. But despite this fact he noted with concern that what he called " a spirit of defeatism " was rampant among the bourgeois classes. It appeared that in his " belief " that the revolution had been crushed and broken ; he was near to being the only man in step. He said that from Asturias journalists reported to him that " the situation was very similar to the situation prevailing shortly before the outbreak of the revolt. A new revolt in the near future was definitely expected." The sensational character of this revelation evidently consists in more than the fact—itself of startling rarity—that Lerroux had spoken the truth.

Anybody who visited Asturias immediately after the military occupation of a section of the mining area could observe for himself the accuracy of the reports brought to and mentioned by Lerroux. Neither the working class nor the bourgeois population of the occupied areas believed that the " revolution was over." An indication of the attitude of the bourgeoisie is given by the view of commercial travellers who, on the strength of the Government propaganda which penetrated and permeated most of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bourgeois press of the world, might have been supposed to have been having an active and happy time booking orders for replacement of stock, refitting of damaged buildings, etc. Far from it. The commercial travellers are sitting in the principal hotels of Oviedo, explaining to one another and to anyone else who will listen sympathetically, how impossible it is to do any business at all, because all the prospective buyers operate on the assumption that "the Reds will come back." They believed that then, three weeks ago, and they believe it now. One more instance, from Madrid, of this absolutely basic and essential fact in the present situation, namely the fact of the power of the revolutionary movement, of the "Marxists."

In a certain enterprise in Madrid the majority, but not all the workers employed, answered the strike call in the first week of October. The workers who did not come out were anarchist or unorganised workers. Before the end of the strike they had all come out. Before the end of the strike, too, the employers concerned had made great play with open promises of victimisation. They declared their intention to victimise, in the most public and violent manner they could, as a means of counter-revolutionary propaganda. The revolutionary committee of the workers of this enterprise was composed of five socialists, four communists, two anarchists, and a varying number of unorganised workers. On the day when the strike was called off the workers returned to the factory and the majority of them, including of course all the militants, were sacked on the spot. The revolutionary committee immediately met and formulated its demand for reinstatement of all strikers. This they presented to the company which flamboyantly turned them down. The revolutionary committee met again, and drew up a letter to the Ministry of Labour, demanding that pressure be brought on the company to abandon its stand. The Minister of Labour immediately turned down the demand. The revolutionary committee met for the third time. They sent a deputation to the Minister of Labour. Their attitude, and the information he had received from his own sources regarding the strength behind their resistance, was such that the Minister anxiously telephoned to the company and warned them that it would be less dangerous to accept the demands of the men, and abandon the victimisation which only a few days before had been so triumphantly announced. The company knuckled down.

Now it is true on the one hand that this experience is far from being universal. It is equally true that it is far from being unique. In other words the plans made by big business and by the fascists to be carried out in the event of a complete crushing of the resistance of the workers have had to be abandoned on a very large scale. The same thing, that is to say, the maintenance of the anti-fascist barrier, is further evidenced by the backstairs manœuvres to which Lerroux and his backers have been

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forced to resort ever since the end of the General Strike, which they had supposed would put them in a position free from the necessity of using the backstairs to fascism any longer.

The fascist drive since the revolt expresses itself in three main ways. One is the relatively stealthy and cautious pushing forward of the C.E.D.A. (Gil Roble's organisation) towards control of the Government. The stealth and the caution are conditioned and necessitated by the fear of renewed revolt. The second method is the method of military and police terrorism, carried out in a series of sporadic outbursts. Its object of course is to break up piecemeal the militant forces of the proletariat as a preparation for the new fascist push. The third is the attempted disorganisation of the " Marxist unions " and the establishment of Catholic, " anti-Marxist," and National Syndicalist Unions.

That the attack on the Socialist Trade Unions is being carried on with fury is certain. Innumerable Union headquarters have been closed down, thousands of Union leaders have been arrested, hundreds have been killed by soldiers in the streets, tortured to death by police in the police stations, quietly done to death in the prisons, or " shot while trying to escape." At the same time it is exceedingly difficult to get any sort of accurate picture of how far and in what places the Government has been successful in actually destroying the Union organisations.

From everything that has been mentioned already in this article, it would seem fairly clear that the attempt has been only partially successful. There is a further indication of the same thing. The Catholic newspapers invariably publish with shouts of triumph, every instance they can lay their hands on, of workers who have torn up their union cards and joined one of the Catholic or fascist union organisations. But the number which, even with the best will in the world, they have been able to publish, is extraordinarily small. It is even more difficult to check up on the development of the various " anti-Marxist " unions. It is certain that a number of workers whose Socialist unions were unable to safeguard them from victimisation have in fact, without formally quitting their own Trade Union, joined up in one or other of the Catholic unions because these are able in some cases to provide jobs off a list of supporting employers. This is true of young Primo de Rivera's organisation—openly imitative of Hitlerism—called the J.O.N.S. (Youth National-Sindicalist Offensive).

It was possible in Madrid, however, to establish these three interesting facts about the large numbers of workmen who were thronging the courtyard of the J.O.N.S. headquarters. First they had been promised jobs, and were getting jobs through the J.O.N.S. Secondly, they had been promised arms, and were getting arms through the J.O.N.S. Thirdly, a very large proportion of these arms were promptly delivered into the secret stores of the revolutionary organisations.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is important to notice, moreover, that direct observation and the study of newspaper photographs, combine to prove what was already fairly clear, namely that the fascist strike-breaking and terrorist organisations operating more or less inefficiently throughout Spain during the General Strike, were composed almost exclusively of young bourgeois, similar in type to those who enrolled for similar work during the British General Strike of 1926. The proletarian element was almost entirely lacking, showing the relatively feeble effects to date of the demagogic propaganda of Rivera and his associates.

While the anarchist leaders continue their policy of open treachery—in some cases actually demanding from employers the dismissal of socialist workers who joined in the struggle—it is clear that among the socialist leaders the experience of the armed struggle has had effects perhaps as important as the effects of their experiences in collaboration with the bourgeois government after the fall of the monarchy. In a series of interviews—notably one given by Prieto in Paris—they have freely admitted a number of mistakes in their policy previous to the armed revolt against fascism and for the seizure of power. Particularly they have now agreed with the thesis put forward at the outset by the Communists, namely the absolute necessity of drawing the peasants into the struggle, partly on account of the enormous numerical strength of the peasant population, partly because the question of the peasants involves too the question of the Army, which is recruited mainly from among the peasants. The recruiting of the army from among the peasants is actually supposed by the Right to be a certain safeguard against sedition in the army. It is clear, however, from the tremendous struggles and the highly developed methods of struggle carried out by the peasants throughout the years since the fall of the monarchy, and from what is known of the feeling prevailing in the army itself, that this is in reality no safeguard at all. The only safeguard hitherto has been the fact that the socialist leaders were extremely slow to undertake a genuine campaign among the peasants.

The experiences of the revolt have admittedly underlined heavily the correctness of the proposals put forward by the Communist Party when the Communist Party entered the Workers' Alliances. These included the pushing forward of work among the peasants and in the army, and full participation by the Workers' Alliances in the day-to-day partial struggles of the workers.

It is particularly notable that Asturias, and those districts of Asturias where the organisation of the struggle, the organisation of the Soviets, and the resistance to the attack of the Government troops reached their highest point, were precisely the places where the Workers' Alliances had most actively participated in the partial struggles of the miners. For example, at Lama de Sangreo there had been in progress for a fortnight before the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Strike a small local strike arising out of a protest against the employment of a company doctor whose carelessness had caused the death of a miner. It was precisely in those places where the Workers' alliances, following the suggestions of the Communist Party, had succeeded is establishing factory, mine, workshop and village Councils of Action on a united front basis, that the resistance to fascism was strongest and the struggle for power most successful.

One fact alone is sufficient to indicate the correctness of the Communist suggestions, and the response to them among the workers which showed itself so soon as the Communist Party, through the Workers' Alliances had succeeded in getting these correct policies partially adopted. It is that the anarchists, who had remained outside the Workers' Alliances, and flatly rejected any co-operation whatever with the proposed Councils of Action, were within a very short time compelled to make a great effort to capture the Councils of Action by getting members of the Anarchist organisation elected to them. Wherever they succeeded in this they immediately killed the Council concerned. But their anxiety to capture the Councils showed how important a power the Councils had become even in the very short period between the beginning of their formation and the outbreak of the revolt.

LABOUR MONTHLY READERS!

Most of you have them
Others haven't

What?—**GOOD BOOKS**

HELP THOSE WHO HAVEN'T:

Send what you can, for
sale at Reasonable Prices, to

DAILY WORKER BAZAAR,
41 TABERNACLE STREET, LONDON, E.C. 2

OTHER GIFTS EQUALLY WELCOME

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY IN IRELAND

By GEORGE GILMORE

(The following is the substance of a report personally given by the well-known Irish Republican leader, George Gilmore, to the Republican Congress, held in Dublin on September 29th and 30th last, on behalf of the Organising Bureau of that Congress.)

THE problem of agriculture is the biggest one facing the future Republican Government. It is big because agriculture is the main industry of the country and will remain so for some time at least. It is big because of the complex nature of the problem created by the Land Acts, because of the uneconomic holdings of Connacht and the western seaboard, because of the difficulty of transporting many of those small holders to the ranches of the midlands and the south, because of the problem of the landless man. It is a task that will require much straight thinking and firm decision.

The Fianna Fail Government owes its strength to the support of the small farmers secured through promises of non-payment of annuities, relief from rates, division of ranches, reduction of taxation generally. Promises glibly made before the elections, but almost forgotten now. The cry of non-payment of land annuities carried Fianna Fail to power. It was put forward first as an idea that no annuities need be paid by the farmer and later that the annuities would be paid, but that there would be rebatement of rates on agricultural land. Undoubtedly the land annuities as such have been retained, and they have been reduced by 50 per cent., but there has been no effort to carry out the promise of full rebate of rates. The British took up the cudgels at once, and proceeded to collect those annuities in the form of taxation on exports from Ireland to England, those exports being cattle, pigs, eggs, bacon, butter. So that the last position is almost as bad as the first. We say almost, because the refusal to collect voluntarily and pay those land annuities, as was being done by the Cosgrave Government, is at least a declaration of our right to the ownership of the soil of Ireland and the effort to undo the Conquest.

But the failure of the Fianna Fail Government to meet the new situation that arose with the taxation of our exports by England was proof of their utter incapacity and their complete lack of foresight. If that Government had immediately placed an embargo on all exports to England, and refused to allow one pennyworth of taxed goods to leave

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the country, the British Government would be faced with a serious problem. Their farmers would be deprived of young cattle to develop and finish, their butchers would soon be short of beef, their grocers would be short of bacon, butter and eggs. Prices would increase owing to this shortage. Such workers would be idle at Birkenhead, Liverpool, Glasgow and other lairages, and demands for a reversal of policy would be made by all sorts of people affected. On the other hand, the Irish Government could pay the farmers 50 per cent. of the value of their saleable stock and ask them to hold them during the necessary period.

Instead of taking this in hand, the Fianna Fail Government proceeded to subsidise exports, to place a high price on butter to the Irish workers, and to sell it at almost half that price to the British. They taxed the Irish people so that cheap beef and cheap mutton, cheap bacon and cheap eggs could be given to the English, while at home the prices charged were such that the majority of our workers are compelled to live on tea, bread and margarine.

The absolute madness of this policy is further exemplified in the methods by which those subsidies are paid. Instead of being paid at the source where the Irish farmer would receive them direct, they are paid to the exporters who buy as cheaply as they can, and they can buy almost at any price because they are organised. The huge profits made by those exporters in recent years is a common boast of cattle buyers in the hotel bar-rooms throughout the country.

But the small farmer is the one hardest hit by this economic war. He is the producer of the yearling bullock and heifer which he sells to the rancher of the midlands. The fall in the prices of this class of stock is out of all proportion to the 40 per cent. tariff placed on exports by the English. Before the economic war started, he could get £6 to £8 for a yearling ; to-day he is lucky if he gets £2 or £2 10s. Thus the rancher is still making a considerable profit on his purchase because he is receiving the subsidy on the 2-year or 3-year bullock, which in many cases he exports direct, and he is buying at a much lower price.

Recently we have had legislation making it compulsory on purchasers of country or home-made butter to pay a subsidy to the Government of 2d. per lb. This tax was put on ostensibly because country butter was interfering with the sale of creamery butter. Now the making of country butter is almost confined entirely to the west of Ireland—Mayo, particularly—where there are very few creameries. The farmers in this district have usually one, two or three cows. Very rarely one finds a farm of six or more cows. Even if there were creameries, it would scarcely pay the farmer to take his few gallons of milk daily several miles to a creamery. It is heartbreaking to see the farmers' wives hawking their three or four pounds of butter from door to door and from shop

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to shop. This year they were getting 6d. or 8d. per lb. Then the tax of 2d. was put on, and the price immediately dropped to 4d. or 6d., because the shopkeeper was not going to be deprived of any profit, and, as the goods were perishable, the farmers were compelled to sell at the price offered. At the present time, the price is so low that many farmers do not bother even to bring the butter to the towns.

In order to enforce the payment of this tax, the west of Ireland is at present infested with Civil Service inspectors, who call on the shopkeepers in towns and villages to inspect returns, etc. That there is an avoidance of payment of this tax in many cases there is no doubt, but the price paid to the farmer is in all cases reduced because of this tax. It seems strange that inspectors for this purpose can be found overnight, whereas factory inspectors to enforce the Trade Boards Acts could only visit nine shirt factories out of 150 in 1933.

The price of pigs, which are in all cases produced by small farmers, is at present from 34s. to 38s. per cwt. This is a reduction of 14s. per cwt. on the 1913 price, and, as the prices of maize are at present higher than the pre-war prices, the profit, if any, on pig production, is very small. It is for this reason that we demand an immediate relief from land annuities payment on all holdings of 25 acres arable land and under. It is because the small farmer is the hardest hit in this economic war, while the rancher is still enjoying his profits, that we demand preferential treatment for the small farmer as against the rancher.

The various Land Acts passed for the division of the ranches by the British, Cosgrave and Fianna Fail régimes have failed. They have failed because they have been based on fallacies in the idea that the rancher was entitled to compensation and that the landless man and uneconomic holder who took up portions of the divided ranch could pay rent, rates and taxes similar to the farmer who held his land in fee simple, and in addition pay interest and sinking fund on the loan by which the rancher was compensated. The fallacy of this attitude is obvious, and it is clear that those who proposed and passed those Acts did not even understand the fundamental laws of the capitalist economy which they upheld. That law is based on competition—competition for markets and prices. The man paying £10 or £12 per annum annuity is competing in the same market with the man who has taken up some of the divided ranch, and who also pays £10 or £12 annuity, but, in addition, pays £30 or £40 as interest and sinking fund on the loan from the Government. In many cases the latter was compelled to go to the bank to borrow £200 or £300 to stock his land, etc., and the interest on that is added to his annual outgoings. It is impossible for him to find sufficient to pay all these charges, and after a few years he gives up the struggle and throws up the land, finding himself in a far worse position than he was in before.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The whole basis of this form of division of the ranches is wrong. It is wrong historically and economically. The ranch is held by the rancher, but it is not owned by him. He has no moral or legal right to it. It is the result of the Conquest, of thievery, robbery, plunder and exploitation. It must be restored to those who own it—the Irish people. Therefore we say: "Seize the ranches, give no compensation, rather demand restitution of the profits secured by the years of illegal and immoral occupation." Distribute them among landless men and uneconomic holders. Give them credit, machinery, stock, etc., or set up State Farms or co-operative societies to work them. Thus only can the problem of the ranches be dealt with, but it can only be finally dealt with when the Workers' and Farmers' Republic is enthroned.

Prices of agricultural produce have fallen from 288 in 1920 to 137 in 1928 and to 84 in 1933, taking 1911—13 as a standard (100). In March, 1934, a still further fall to 81, showing a constant yearly fall of roughly one-tenth to one-eighth of the price in 1913. What will constitute rock-bottom not even the greatest economic optimist can say. The return for the farmer's hard work is dwindling: farming is becoming even more unprofitable.

The cost of living, in contrast to agricultural prices, fell only from 191 (1914=100) in 1922 to 177 in 1928 and to 151 in February, 1933, that is, the rate of decline is only roughly 4 to 6 points a year over the whole period. So that while the prices obtained fall rapidly, the farmer finds the cost of living for himself and family is not keeping pace to any extent with this mulcting of his income under capitalist economy.

It is thus no wonder that there is a continuous decline in agricultural production. Taking three equally spaced years, we have the following picture:—

	In Thousands of Acres (approx.).		
	1918.	1925.	1932.
1. Corn Crops	1,500	850	760
2. Root and Green Crops ..	890	700	660
3. Total of 1 and 2, with Flax and Fruit	2,400	1,600	1,400
4. Total of all crops, with Hay ..	4,400	3,800	3,700

The area of ploughed land fell from 2,800,000 acres in 1871 to 1,400,000 acres roughly in 1932, that is, cultivation has declined by 50 per cent.—an extraordinary state of affairs.

In the six counties the picture is the same; from cultivation to grass.

While there have been slight increases from 1932 to 1933, in the estimated annual produce of some crops, on the whole there has been an excessive decline in the actual quantities of all crops.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The average of crops for 1933 was as follows (in thousands of acres) :—

	26 Counties	6 Counties.	Ireland.
	(In Thousands of Acres).		
1. Corn Crops	806	279	1,103
2. Root and Green Crops.. ..	641	180	821
3. Total of 1 and 2 with Flax and Fruit	1,455	495	1,950
4. Total of all crops with Hay ..	3,699	943	4,642

While cultivation has declined there has been no increase in live stock to compensate, however inadequately, for this deplorable state of affairs. Since 1918 the number of milch cows has remained constant at roughly 1,200,000. Since 1923 the total number of cattle has fallen by a quarter of a million head. In the last year the number increased by about 100,000, but the explanation of this temporary rise is quite obvious. In the same period the total number of sheep increased by 800,000 head. In the last year for which figures are available, 1933, the number of pigs fell by over 78,000. Since 1918 total poultry increased by 5,000,000.

As to the disposal of the agricultural output (1929-30) including crops and turf, live stock and live stock products, estimated at £65 millions, we exported roughly half ; the agricultural community used less than one-third ; others in the Saorstat used less than one-fifth and only 0.3 per cent. is recorded as an increase in stock. Thus we were still working for the English market and coming to the time when we cease to build up any reserve to face any agricultural calamity in the future.

As compared with 1926 when the grass output was much the same, the agricultural community consumed £2,000,000 less of the output ; the town and village population used substantially the same value ; the export of this produce had increased by four million pounds, and the increase of stock had fallen by a million and a half or from 2½ per cent. to 0.3 per cent. As the country population is roughly 1,800,000, the average consumption had fallen by about £1 per head. How far the fall in prices would relate to this figure is hard to say, but it can be safely gauged that the agricultural population is not receiving any increased portion of the fundamental necessaries of life—rather the reverse.

The productivity of the workers on the land, and of the land itself, is noticeably less in the Free State than in the Six Counties, England, Scotland or Denmark. The value produced per worker in the Free State is given as £96, in the Six Counties as £104, in Scotland as £184, and in Denmark £196 ; while per 100 acres the value of the output in the Free State is £500 ; in the Six Counties £600 ; in Scotland over £750, and in Denmark over £1,000 ; which is a grave reflection of the poorly organised condition of the premier industry in what is talked of as a pre-eminently agricultural country.

(*To be concluded*).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARX AND ENGELS ON THE BRITISH WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT-X

1879—1895

(The following is the final instalment[1] of the extracts from the Correspondence of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels relative to the British Working-class Movement which have been specially translated for the "Labour Monthly" from the original German.)

Here the conference of the Independent Labour Party has been held in Bradford, as you know from the *Workman's Times*. The S.D.F. on the one hand, the Fabians on the other have not, with their sectarian behaviour, been able to absorb the throng to socialism in the provinces, and so the establishment of a third party was very good. But now the rush to socialism, especially in the industrial centres of the North, has become so great that this new party right at this first congress has appeared stronger than S.D.F. or Fabians, if not stronger than both together. And since the *masses* of the members make good decisions, since the weight lies in the provinces and not in London, the centre of cliques, since the programme in its main points is ours, Aveling has done right to join and to take a seat on the Executive. If here, the petty individual strivings and intrigues of the London "would be greats" are curbed a bit and the tactics turn out not too absurd, the Independent Labour Party can succeed in unsettling the masses of the Social Democratic Federation and, in the provinces, the Fabians as well and thereby compelling unity.

The Fabians here in London are a band of place-hunters who have enough understanding to see the inevitability of the social revolution, but who find it impossible to entrust the raw proletariat alone with this tremendous work and therefore have a partiality for putting themselves at the head. Fear of the revolution is their fundamental principle. They are "intellectuals" *par excellence*. Their socialism is municipal socialism; the *commune*, not the nation, should become at least temporarily the owner of the means of production. This socialism of theirs is thus put forward

[1]Previous instalments were published in the issues of September, October and November, 1933, and February, March, April, May, June, and October, 1934. Copies of these numbers can be obtained from the LABOUR MONTHLY, 7 John Street, London, W.C.1, at the price of 6d. (7d. post free).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a most extreme, but inevitable, consequence of bourgeois liberalism, and from this follows their tactics, not to fight the Liberals decisively as an enemy, but to drive them on to socialist conclusions, therefore to play tricks with them, to permeate Liberalism with Socialism, and not to put up Socialist candidates against Liberals, but to palm Socialism off on to them, to foist it on them, alternatively to swindle them into it. That in this they are either themselves betrayed and deceived or are betraying socialism, they naturally do not realise.

With great industry they have produced, among all sorts of rubbish, some good pieces of propaganda, in fact the best that the English have produced in this connection. But as soon as they come on to their specific tactic, to hush up the class struggle, it gets rotten. Hence also their fanatical hatred of Marx and all of us—because of the class struggle.

These people naturally have many bourgeois adherents and therefore money, and have in the provinces many capable workers who do not want to have anything to do with the S.D.F. But five-sixths of the provincial members hold more or less to our point of view, and in a critical moment will definitely desert. In Bedford, where they are represented, they have more than once come out decidedly against the London Executive of the Fabians.

You see it is a critical point for the movement here, and something can come of the new organisation. There was a moment when they nearly got under the wing of Champion, who consciously or unconsciously works for the Tories as the Fabians do for the Liberals—of Champion and his ally Maltman Barry,[2] whom you will know from the Hague (Barry is now a confessed and permanent paid Tory agent and manager of the socialistic wing of the Conservatives !), see the *Workman's Times* of November and December ; but Champion finally preferred to publish his *Labour Elector*[3] again and thereby put himself in opposition to the *Workman's Times* and to the new Party.

Hardie did a clever stroke in putting himself at the head of this new party, and John Burns, whose absolute inactivity apart from his constituency has done him a lot of harm besides, has committed another fool's trick in holding back here too. I am afraid he is working himself well into an untenable position.

[2]Barry, H. Maltman. Member of I.W.M.A., and of London Federal Council, afterwards contributor to *Standard*, *Pall Mall Gazette*, etc., a " Tory Socialist " (or Socialist Tory) ; in 1886, etc., was Champion's henchman in the *Labour Elector* and in getting finance for Labour candidates from uncertain sources, afterwards became full-blown Conservative and was lost in obscurity.

[3]*Labour Elector* was republished for a few months in 1893.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That here also, people like Keir Hardie, Shaw Maxwell[4] and others are following all kinds of subsidiary aims of personal ambition is understood. But the danger arising from this diminishes in proportion as the Party itself becomes more of a mass party and stronger, and is already narrowed by the necessity of being on their guard against the competing sects. Socialism in the industrial centres has penetrated enormously into the masses in the last few years, and I am counting on these masses to keep their leaders in order. Naturally there will be idiocies enough and squabbles of all kinds, if only it is possible to keep them within due limits.

At the worst, the formation of the new organisation has the advantage that with *three* competing sects it will be easier to bring about a union than with two which stand poles apart. *Engels to Sorge*, January 18, 1893.

Here things are going *very well*. The masses are unquestionably in movement. You will learn the details from Aveling's reports—rather verbose it is true—in the *Volkszeitung*. The best proof is that the *old sects* are losing ground and must come into line. The Social Democratic Federation has in fact removed Mr. Hyndman ; he may here and there still grumble and complain a little about international politics in *Justice*, but he is done for, his own people have found him out. The man has provoked me personally and politically for ten years, wherever he could. I have never done him the honour of an answer, convinced that he was the man to do himself in, and I have been proved right in the end. After all this ten years' hostility they have recently asked Tussy to write reports on the international movement in *Justice*, which she naturally refused as long as the infamous insults which *Justice* has made for years against her and Aveling are not officially revoked.

It is just the same with the Fabians. The branches in the provinces have outgrown these people, as they have the S.D.F. ; Lancashire and Yorkshire are again taking the lead in this movement too, as in the Chartist movement. People like Sidney Webb, Bernard Shaw, etc., who wanted to permeate the Liberals with Socialism, now have to put up with being permeated by the spirit of the working-men members of their own society. They scuffle and resist, but it's no use ; either they remain alone, officers without soldiers, or they must follow along. The first is the most likely and also the most to be desired.

The Independent Labour Party—as the last comer—has brought with it less fixed prejudices, has good elements—the workers of the North in particular—and so far is the most genuine expression of the present

[4] J. Shaw Maxwell. Chairman of Executive of Scottish Parliamentary Labour Party in 1888 ; first secretary of I.L.P.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movement. There are to be sure all sorts of comic people among the leaders, and most of the best of them even have the fatal clique habits of the parliamentary régime, just as with you in America, but the masses are behind them and they will either teach them manners or throw them overboard. Blunders there are in plenty, but the chief danger is overcome, and I now expect a rapid advance which will also react on America. *Engels to Sorge*, March 18, 1893.

Here the May demonstration was fine, but it is already becoming rather an everyday, or rather every-year affair ; the first freshness is past. The narrowmindedness of the Trades Council and the Socialist sects—Fabians and S.D.F.—forced us once more to two demonstrations, but everything went as desired and we—the Eight-hour Committee—had a far greater following than the united opposition. Our international platform was especially well attended by the public. I calculate that in all there were 240,000 people in the park, of whom we had 140,000 and the opposition at the most 100,000.

Champion, with the money received from Tory and Liberal Unionists (apparently £100 for each of the 100 workers' candidates which they want to put up in hopeless constituencies merely in order to draw votes away from the Liberals), has been thoroughly shown up by our old Maltman Barry. This blockhead, albeit Scottish speculator, has got mixed up with the Tories, whose paid agent he admittedly is, and seems to have been put beside Champion, whom Messrs. (the money-Tories) don't yet trust properly, as sleeping partner and overseer—what the Jesuits call *socius*. He had edited the *Labour Elector* alone during Champion's illness, and told tales out of school so boastfully that the game was completely spoilt, and the Independent Labour Party for the moment is safe from the danger of becoming the catspaw for these gentlemen. Unfortunately Aveling has been seriously ill for a month ; he is hard to spare with these unending squabbles. He is in Hastings to get his health back a bit. *Engels to Sorge*, May 17, 1893.

Read the article in the *Workman's Times* of to-day by "Autolycus" (Burgess) on the Manifesto of the Fabians. These gentlemen, after declaring for years : the emancipation of the working class can only be accomplished through the Great Liberal Party—and howling down all independent action, against Liberal candidates as well, in elections as concealed Toryism, and giving out the permeation of the Liberal Party by Socialist Principles to be the sole life-task of the socialists, now declare that the Liberals are traitors, nothing can be done with them, and the workers in the next election should put up their own candidates without

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consideration for Liberals or Tories with the help of the £3,000 which the Trade Unions, meanwhile, were to get together—if the Unions do the Fabians this pleasure, which certainly won't happen. It is a complete *pater peccavi* ("Father, I have sinned"—) on the part of these stuck-up bourgeois, who want graciously to condescend to free the proletariat from above, if it would only have the insight to understand that such a raw, uneducated mass cannot free itself and would come to nothing without the gracious kindness of these clever lawyers, literary folk and sentimental females. And now the first attempt of these gentlemen, announced as world-shaking with the beating of drums and the sounding of trumpets, has failed so brilliantly that they themselves must acknowledge it. That is the humour of history. *Engels to Sorge*, November 11, 1893.

Here complete disorganisation prevails among the official politicians, as much with the Liberals as with the Conservatives. The Liberals can keep themselves going only through fresh political and social concessions to the workers ; but for that they're wanting in courage. So they are trying it with an election cry again the House of Lords, instead of proposing payment of members, payment of election expenses by the Government, and second ballot. That means, instead of offering the workers more power against bourgeois and lords, they want merely to give the bourgeois more power against the lords and the workers are no longer being taken in by that. In the summer, however, there will in any case be a general election here, and if the Liberals don't pull themselves together *a great deal* and make *real* concessions to the workers, they will be beaten and go to pieces ; now it is only Gladstone that is holding them together, and he can kick the bucket any day. Then there'll be a bourgeois-democratic party with tendencies friendly to the workers, and the rest of the Liberals will go over to Chamberlain. And all this owing to the sheer pressure of the working class, still split in itself and half unconscious. If this class gradually comes to consciousness, then things'll go very differently yet. *Engels to Sorge*, February 23, 1894.

Here things are going all out for the dissolution of Parliament. At the elections more Labour candidates are being put up than ever before, but not enough yet by a long way, and I am not sure whether a whole lot of them are not again being put up with Tory money. The Liberals, like the Tories, both stick hard to the indirect eligibility-qualification, which rests on burdening the candidates with the entire cost of the election—100 pounds sterling at a minimum up to 400 to 600 pounds sterling and even more for the official costs : polling places, etc. If

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the workers fall into Champion's claws, who is offering them 100 pounds sterling per constituency (he got the money from the soap manufacturer Hudson), then the Liberals have got no reason for grumbling. Altogether they are approaching the elections with a curiously stubborn misconstruction of the circumstances. They go on as if they wanted to abolish the *Upper House*, but decline to change the shape of the *Lower House* (by strengthening the Labour force) in such a way that it alone is in a position to set about doing something. On the other side the Tories are stupider than ever before, and that's saying a lot. For two years they have been positively playing the deuce with the Liberal Government in the Lower and Upper Houses ; the Liberals have serenely put up with it and the philistine, turned conservative in a lump, has rejoiced over it because it was done under the pretext of removing the treasonable anti-imperial Home Rule Bill and Home Rule Government. But now they are also carrying on the game to the accompaniment of stern English measures, and that might certainly become rather too stiff for the peaceable philistine. So that things are very uncertain and the elections will in any case produce surprising results—anyhow, strengthening of the workers and necessity for the Liberals to make further concessions to the workers. *Engels to Sorge*, March 21, 1894.

Here things are going as usual. No chance of getting any kind of unity among the Labour leaders. But nevertheless the *masses* are moving forward, slowly to be sure and wrestling for consciousness, but yet unmistakably. It will go here as in France and earlier in Germany : unity will be enforced as soon as there are a number of independent (especially those elected without Liberal help) workers in Parliament. To prevent this the Liberals are doing their utmost. They are extending (1) the franchise not even to the people who have it already now *on paper* ; on the contrary they are making (2) the voters' lists even more expensive *for the candidates* than hitherto, for they are to be compiled twice a year and the cost of a *correct* compilation falls on the candidates or alternatively the representatives of the political *parties*, and not on the State ; they refuse (3) positively to allow election expenses to be taken over by the State or the local authorities ; also (4) payment of members and (5) second ballots. All this preserving of old abuses is a direct ban on eligibility for Labour candidates in three-fourths and more of the constituencies. Parliament is to remain a *club for rich people*. And this at a time when the rich people, because they are satisfied with the *status quo*, are all becoming conservative and the Liberal Party is dying out and becoming more and more dependent on the Labour vote ; but the Liberals stick to it that the workers are to elect only bourgeois, not workers and most certainly not independent workers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is where the Liberals are going smash. Their want of courage is alienating from them the labour votes in the country, dispersing their small majority in Parliament, and if at the last moment they don't take *very bold* steps, then they're probably lost. Then the Tories come in and *carry out what* the Liberals actually meant to carry out—not merely to promise. And then an independent labour party is pretty certain.

The Social Democratic Federation here shares with your German-American socialists the distinction of being the only parties that have managed to reduce the Marxist theory of development to a rigid orthodoxy, to which the workers are not to work themselves up out of their own class-feeling, but which they have to choke down right away as an article of faith and without development. That is why both remain mere sects and come, as Hegel says, from nothing through nothing to nothing. *Engels to Sorge*, May 12, 1894.

The movement here still resembles the American, except that it is *somewhat* ahead of you. The mass-instinct that the workers must form a party of their own against the two official parties is getting stronger and stronger: again showed itself more than ever in the municipal elections of November 1. But the old traditional memories of various kinds, and the lack of people able to turn this instinct into conscious action and to rally it together all over the country, encourage the persistence in this early stage of the haziness of thought and local isolation of the action. Anglo-Saxon sectarianism prevails also in the working-class movement. The Social Democratic Federation, just like your German S.A.P., has managed to transform our theory into the rigid dogma of an orthodox sect, is narrow-mindedly exclusive. The Independent Labour Party is extremely uncertain in its tactics, and its leader Keir Hardie is a more than crafty Scot. He has—although a poor devil of a Scottish coalminer—founded a big weekly paper, "The Labour Leader," that was not to be set up without a lot of money, and this money is coming to him from Tory-ist or rather Liberal-Unionist, that is to say from anti-Gladstone and anti-Home Rule quarters; of this there can be no doubt, and as much his notorious literary connections in London as direct information and his political attitude confirm this. Consequently he can—through desertion of the Irish and radical voters—very easily lose his seat in Parliament in the general election of 1895.

Otherwise, especially in the provinces, there are in the Social Democratic Federation as much as in the Independent Labour Party some very good elements, but scattered, although at least they have seen to it that all attempts on the part of the leaders to incite the two organisations one against the other fail over and over again.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Politically, John Burns stands pretty well alone ; he is violently attacked as much by Hyndman as by Keir Hardie and he goes on as if he were despairing of the political organisation of the workers and placing his hopes on no more than the Trade Unions. He has, to be sure, had experience of these and might be starving if the Engineers' Union were not paying him his parliamentary salary. He is conceited and has let himself be rather well soaped by the Liberals, that is to say, by the " social wing " of the Radicals and puts decidedly too much weight on the many single concessions he has got through, but for all that he is the only really honest fellow in the movement, that is to say, among the leaders, and has an utterly proletarian instinct which will, I believe, guide him in the decisive moment more correctly than craftiness and interested calculation will do with the others. *Engels to Sorge*, November 10, 1894.

2. *Justice* which I will again send to you regularly on account of the tiff with the Germans, who cannot leave it alone. What the paper says about triumphs of the S.D.F. is nearly all lies ; the S.D.F. is relatively going down against the other organisations, especially against the I.L.P. ; if things go on like this, it will soon go down absolutely. Unfortunately the I.L.P. no longer has a proper paper. *Engels to Sorge*, December 4, 1894.

The development of the Anglo-Saxon race with its ancient Germanic liberty is really a quite characteristic, slow, zig-zag shaped development (here in England small zig-zags, with you colossal ones), a tacking against the wind, but forward it goes, all the same. *Engels to Sorge*, January 16, 1895.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEW

TOWARDS THE MISUNDERSTANDING OF MARX.

Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx. By Sidney Hook. (Gollancz. 288 pp. 5s.)

ON the cover of the second impression of Hook's book is the following extract from a review by Professor Laski: "It is not too high praise of this book to say that it is, on the whole, the best introduction to the study of Marxism now available in English." In fact, Hook has so far surpassed Laski in the work of distorting Marxism that even this by no means modest professor feels bound to pay his respects to the excellence of his work!

Hook's book starts with an attack on "orthodoxy." This is the usual procedure for the bourgeois "sympathetic" student of Marxism, as a preliminary to the work of distortion and misrepresentation. Trotsky has always been a master of such declarations. In his case it was "Bolshevik sectarianism" in the days before the October Revolution, when Lenin was leading the Party, and to-day it is "Stalinist bureaucracy." But Mr. Hook is too tactful to mention names. He simply states that his book "is not written by an 'orthodox' Marxist." He then implies that by 'orthodox' Marxism he means the utter opportunism of the leaders of the Second International. He uses the following words: "Indeed, the author regards the orthodox Marxism in the form in which it flourished from 1895 to 1917 as an emasculation of Marx's thought. He holds that Marx himself was not an orthodox Marxist." (p. 6). Well—this is alright. If Mr. Hook is simply attacking the Second International, we are wholeheartedly with him, and his formulation of the matter, at this point, is calculated to gain the reader's sympathy. But what of the "form" of "orthodox Marxism" after 1917? We would presume from Hook's special reference to the period from 1895 to 1917 that he considered that 1917 had meant a fundamental change. But does he? Here are his own words: First: "Orthodoxy is not only fatal to honest thinking; it involves the abandonment of the revolutionary standpoint which was central to Marx's life and work" (p. 6). And second—and here we see what Hook really means by "orthodoxy": "There is no justification for the easy assumption made by the self-styled 'orthodox' that there is a complete identity in the doctrines and standpoints of Marx and Engels from the beginning of their friendship on . . ." (p. 35). Thus, Hook first of all condemns "orthodoxy," and specially mentions the period from 1895 to 1917, as a manœuvre, to disarm those who are favourable to Leninism and the Third International from 1917 onwards. Then, some pages later, he defines orthodoxy as including all who recognise the complete identity of outlook of Marx and Engels. But under this definition, of course, Lenin and the Third International are "orthodox," so, according to Hook, Marxism after 1917 is also condemned. Thus, by so many twists and manœuvres Hook states in so many words that he is both against the Marxism of the Second International, and against the Marxism of the Third International.

But not only is Hook an opponent of the Third International, but he has even found disagreements between Marx, Engels and Lenin. Marx and Engels did not agree, he says: "There is no justification for the easy assumption . . . that there is a complete identity" in their views. Further, there is a divergence in view between Lenin the revolutionary (who followed Marx) and Lenin the philosopher (who followed Engels). Such is Mr. Hook's novel way of splitting the working-class movement!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

" Peculiarly enough," writes Mr. Hook, " Lenin overlooks the incompatibility between his political activism and its underlying dynamic philosophy of interaction as expressed in *What is to be done?*, and the mechanical correspondence theory of knowledge—defended so vehemently by him in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. Here he follows Engels word for word in his statement that ' sensations are copies, photographs, images and mirror-reflections of things,' and that the mind is not active in knowing " (p. 61). Marx, according to Hook, was the only real dialectician of the three, for he wrote : " The chief defect of all previous materialism (including Feuerbach's) is that the thing—reality—sensation—has been considered only in the form of the object or of direct apprehension ; and not as sensory human activity, not as practice, subjectively " (p. 89).

Now let us examine what Lenin actually *does* say, and in what connection. In the passage quoted by Hook, (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* (p. 195), Lenin writes " " Engels speaks neither of symbols nor hieroglyphics, but of copies, photographs, images, mirror-reflections of things." Lenin does not add, what is added on his behalf by Mr. Hook, that " the mind is not active in knowing." In this particular passage Lenin is concerned with the fundamental difference between materialism and idealism. On page 22 of the same book Lenin also writes about " things and their mental images." But he explicitly states in this connection that " the argument here is not at all about this or that formulation of materialism, but about the opposition of materialism to idealism, about the difference of two trends of thought in philosophy."

Thus, while Lenin, in the passage quoted, is dealing with the fundamental difference between Materialism and Idealism, Marx, in the passage quoted from him, is dealing with different formulations of Materialism. Hook, however, completely ignores this fact, and adds to Lenin the phrase " that the mind is not active in knowing."

If Mr. Hook had taken the trouble to read what Lenin had to say about the rôle of Practice, which he considers in connection with Agnosticism (which is, as Engels said, " shamefaced materialism "), he would have found that both Lenin and Engels were absolutely and entirely in agreement with Marx. " The best refutation of . . . agnosticism as well as of other philosophical whims is practice, repeats Engels. ' The success of our actions proves the correspondence of our perception with the objective nature of the objects perceived,' he answers the agnostics." *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* (p. 109). This statement is entirely in accord with the quotation given by Hook from Marx, which attacks " previous materialism " for considering things only as " object " and ignoring human practice. The point is that (1) in attacking idealism, Lenin was concerned with pointing out that ideas are but the reflection of reality, and (2) in considering different *forms* of materialism, Marx, Engels and Lenin were at one in stressing that the process of reflecting reality includes human practice. Hook, by selecting his quotations from passages dealing with entirely different problems, and by writing in a phrase which Lenin and Engels would never in their life have dreamt of writing, has built up this magnificent divergence of opinion between Marx and Engels, and between Lenin the Revolutionary and Lenin the Philosopher. Unfortunately, the original materials are not available to all readers, and the erudite style of Mr. Hook is likely to take in quite a number.

Since this was one of the most fundamental of Hook's attacks on Marxism, we have devoted much space to it. We can only very briefly run over some of the numerous other falsifications that fill this book.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

First—on the question of Ethics. Ethical values are, to the Marxist, expressions of real social needs. The scientific socialist is concerned with formulating these basic needs, and with abandoning the ethical terminology which simply serves to obscure the real issue. Hook, of course, does the opposite, and is concerned with introducing into Marxism a whole mass of ethical terms. Thus, for example: "The scientific approach to society involves the continuous application of ideals . . ." (p. 67). This is completely false. The scientific approach to society necessitates the explanation in terms of sociology of the "ideals" of each stage of social development. And again: "The only formal ethical invariant he (Marx) recognised, was man's desire for 'the better'" (p. 263). On the contrary, Marx pointed out that "man's desire for 'the better'" was in every case the expression of concrete real needs. Marx was concerned with *exposing* these concrete needs, and with *disposing of* the ethical superstructure which suggested that man's activity was motivitated by ethical desires for "the better" and such like. But Hook is determined to drag Marx back into the ranks of bourgeois sociologists, who have never broken away from ethics in their study of society, and have never therefore succeeded in becoming really scientific. Again, we may quote one more example of this completely anti-Marxist interpretation of history give by Hook: "The fact that human behaviour is undertaken in behalf of ends or ideals distinguishes the subject matter of history . . ." (p. 106). But Marx went to great pains to show that "ends" and "ideals" are simply a reflection of real material needs, and that to understand history we must understand these needs which are the basic factor. The ideals, the reflection of the needs, are secondary, and not primary as Hook makes out.

Second, in dealing with Marx's Economics, Hook again rewrites Marx in the bourgeois tradition. Thus, for example, whereas Marx repeatedly emphasised that the basic contradiction of capitalism was the contradiction in production, between the social nature of the productive process and the private ownership of the means of production; and while Marx repeatedly pointed out that "distribution theories" are bourgeois theories which do not explain the situation; Hook calmly distorts Marx's economics into a bourgeois theory of mal-distribution. Thus, instead of the contradiction of capitalism as Marx expressed it, Hook writes: "At a point when it no longer becomes possible on the basis of the existing distribution of income to permit the available productive processes to function to capacity . . ." (p. 122)—a phrase which is more like part of a Labour Party pamphlet than anything that was ever written by Marx.

Or, again, just look at this example of utter confusion and muddle: "It is no longer a question of which class shall enjoy ownership of the social functions of production" (p. 124). How any class can "own" a "social function" of "production" it remains for Hook to explain, but apparently this helps Mr. Laski, if nobody else, to understand Marxism!

Again, in dealing with the Labour Theory of Value, Hook shows an expert's skill in confusing the issue. Is this theory correct or is it not?—Hook does not tell us. But he does say this: "The labour theory of value can be saved. But why save it? . . ." (p. 187). In other words, the fundamental basis of Marxian economics, the key to an understanding of capitalism and therefore a guide to its overthrow, is not worth saving! Some bourgeois economists have attacked the labour theory, but it takes a Hook to dismiss it like this.

Finally, we must mention the passages in which Professor Hook attacks Marx and Engels for not being sufficiently revolutionary! Here is "Leftism" with a vengeance. You see, Marx in his time stated that in England a social

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolution *might* be effected by peaceful and legal means. (By the way, is the misprint which reads 'social evolution' instead of 'social revolution' on p. 244 merely a misprint?). But Marx also suggested that the ruling class would hardly submit without a pro-slavery rebellion. This, to Hook, is absurd. "As if it were not precisely the danger of a 'pro-slavery' rebellion —a counter-revolution—which demanded that the revolution everywhere assure its victory by a resort to force" (p. 245). As usual, Hook's main purpose is to discredit in every way the great leaders whose ideas he pretends to expound. In the case in point it was perfectly clear what Marx meant. He meant that the actual seizure of power, in England, was conceivable by legal—and therefore peaceful—means. But that, power having been obtained legally, then naturally there would be the possibility of rebellion. But in such a case, instead of the workers having to seize power illegally, by overthrowing the existing State machine, in this particular case it was conceivable that this would not be necessary. Since to-day the conditions are quite different, this question no longer arises in the form in which Marx put it. But it is amusing to find Mr. Hook spending several pages on attacking Marx for not being revolutionary enough!

It is impossible in a short review to deal with all the distortions contained in this book. However, sufficient has been quoted to show the kind of student of Marx the author is. His attack on "orthodoxy"; while he identifies "orthodoxy" not only with the Second but the Third International; his absurd attempt to split Engels from Marx and Lenin from Lenin; his ignorance of Marx's economics and his contempt for the Labour Theory of Value all show where he stands. It is not surprising that that other great bourgeois student of Marxism, Professor Laski, should have found this book so worthy of his august praise.

P. A. S.

[Next Month it is hoped to publish a detailed and comprehensive review of a very important volume of selections from the Correspondence of Marx and Engels, hitherto unpublished in book form in the English language, which is about to be issued by Messrs. Martin Lawrence at 12/6.]

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

Red China. President Mao Tse-Tung. (Martin Lawrence.) 36 pp. 6d.
William Morris: A Vindication. R. Page Arnot. (Martin Lawrence.) 32 pp. 6d.
"Left Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder. V. I. Lenin. (Martin Lawrence.) 95 pp. 1s.
The Nazi Horror: German Concentration Camps. (Martin Lawrence.) 60 pp. 6d.
Scientific Construction in the U.S.S.R. Voks Illustrated Almanacs. (Martin Lawrence.) 223 pp.
Literature of the Peoples of the U.S.S.R. Voks Illustrated Almanacs. (Martin Lawrence.) 209 pp.
The Mind in the Making. James Harvey Robinson. (Watts & Co.) 148 pp. 1s.
The Expression of the Emotions. Charles Darwin. (Watts & Co.) 179 pp. 1s.
The Shorter Working Week. H. M. Vernon. (Routledge.) 201 pp. 8s. 6d.
Western Civilisation and the Natives of South Africa. I. Shapera. (Routledge.) 312 pp. 15s.
A Guide to Modern Politics. G. D. H. & M. I. Cole. (Gollancz.) 559 pp. 6s.
Sea Power in the Modern World. Admiral Sir Herbert Richmond. (Bell.) 266 pp. 10s. 6d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Index to Volume XVI

January-December, 1934

I.—AUTHORS

		Pages
A.J.W.	The Youth in Two Worlds	127–128
	Metal Fatigue—or Sabotage?	319–320
ALLEN, THOMAS	Austria and the Art of Insurrection	233–238
ALLISON, GEORGE	R.P.D. on Fascism and Social Revolution	440–443
	The Next Steps in the Fight against Fascism	728–734
ANDREWS, R. F.	The Labour Party Prepares for War	663–674
ARNOT, R. PAGE	William Morris Versus the Morris Myth	178–184
	1914 and 1934	488–496
	The Spanish Civil War	680–685
BARRISTER AT LAW	The Meaning of the Sedition Bill	403–412
BRADLEY, BEN.	The Background in India	173–177
B.W.	World Communists in Session	446–448
CONZE, E.	Dialectical Materialism and Communism. A Postscript. 1. A Reply to Rudas	692–694
DARWEN, R.	Railways and the Struggle Against Fascism	295–302
D.G.	Dictatorship and the Commune	128
DIMITROV, GEORGI	Letter to the Austrian Workers	353–364
DUBOW, HARRY	Robbery of the Public	44–47
EHRENBOURG, ILYA	Now they Are Madmen	373–379
ELLIS, HAVELOCK	War and the Fighting Instinct	627–628
ENGELS, FRIEDRICH	Marx and Engels on the British Working-Class Movement. 1879/1895	
	120–126, 185–191, 249–253, 308–313, 380–384, 749–756	629–632
G.A.H.	A Very Superficial Survey	255
	More than a Guide Book	255–256
GANNES, HARRY	The "New Deal" Swindle	418–427
G.F.	Co-operation in the U.S.S.R.	635–636
GILMORE, GEORGE	Agriculture and Industry in Ireland	744–748
GOLLAN, JOHN	The Congress of Action and Youth in Industry	225–232
	Muzzling the League of Youth	735–738
G.W.M.	A Bolshevik at Work	62–64
HANNINGTON, WAL.	The Meaning of the New Unemployment Bill	36–43
HENRI, ERNST	The 30th of June and the Revolutionary Development in Germany	502–512
	The New Political Perspectives in Germany	545–554
HERBST, JOSEPHINE	American Farmers Ride into Action	114–119
HOLMES, W. M.	The Powder Magazine in the Far East	85–89
JELLINEK, FRANK	Stavisky—a Portent	153–160
JOANNIDES, EVDOROS	Terror in Cyprus	303–307
KIDD, RONALD	The Progress of the Sedition Bill	613–620
LABOUR MONTHLY EDITOR	A Questionnaire on War. I. Report and Analysis	464–471
LAO, LIU	China and the Policy of the Kuomintang	239–244

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

		Pages
LAYNE, A.	The Struggle against Fascism	245–248
LENIN, V. I.	Features of the Labour Movement	32–35
MAGYAR, L.	The Bankruptcy of Trotskyism	365–372
MAHON, JOHN A.	Towards the Counter Offensive	280–286
	The Hays Wharf Strike	413–417
	The Trades Union Congress and the United Front	536–544
MARX, KARL	Marx and Engels and the British Working-Class Movement. 1879/1895	120–126, 185–191, 249–253, 308–313, 380–384, 629–632, 749–756
MOFFATT, AB.	Successes in the Scottish Miners' Struggles	165–172
OBSERVER	Towards the I.L.P. Easter Conference. II. The International Question	96–100
O'NEILL, BRIAN	The Irish Labour Party and Fascism	48–52
P.A.S.	A Partial Exposure of Idealism	701–704
	Towards the Misunderstanding of Marx	757–760
P.A.T.	Problems of Socialist Evasion	637
RATHBONE, H.	General Strike and Uprising in Austria	145–152
R.P.A.	Morris Biographised	254
R.P.D.	After Ten Years	5–24
	From 1844 to 1934	57–61
	The National March and Congress	69–84
	The I.L.P. Choice	131–142
	Whither 1934?	195–219
	May Day, 1934	259–272
	British Fascism	314–317
	The Race to War	325–340
	The Anti-Fascist Front	387–402
	"Marxism" in Caricature	432–439
	The Fight Against War	451–464
	New Issues	519–535
	The Anti-Fascist Front	583–596
	The War Question and the Labour Party	597–598
	The United Front and the Labour Party	647–661
	Politics of the Socialist League	696–699
	The Fight for the United Front	711–727
R.S.	The Plaint of a Social Fascist	318–319
RUDAS, L.	Dialectical Materialism and Communism: A Postscript	563–572
	Dialectical Materialism and Communism. A Postscript: II. Conze Answered	694–695
RUST, WILLIAM	After the Congress of Action	220–224
	The Socialist League—What Next?	675–679
R.W.B.	Religion and Communism	61–62
SHELTON, SAM.	Strike Struggles in Birmingham	109–113
SHIELDS, J.	The T.U.C., Labour Party and Fascism	599–606
	The Republican Congress and Ireland's Fight	686–691
SINGH, M.	The Struggle of the Indian Workers	346–352
SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT	Councils of Action in Spain	739–743
STALIN, J.	Lenin	25–31
STRACHEY, JOHN	Two Views of Roosevelt	444–446
	The Prospects of the Anti-Fascist Struggle	607–612

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

		Pages
T.H.W.	A Poem. The Test	144
	How Not to Fight War	699–701
UPTON, ARTHUR EDGAR	Speeding up Engineering To-day	287–294
WHALLEY ERIC,	Towards the I.L.P. Easter Conference I. Trends in the I.L.P.	90–96
	The Conference of the I.L.P. and After	273–279
WILSON, D.	Crisis and the Way Forward in Woollens	101–108
WINTRINGHAM, T. H.	War from the Air	497–501
WOOLLEY, E.	Who Fights Against Starvation ?	161–164
	The May-Day Strike at Lucas	341–345
W.R.	Lenin on Britain	633–635
YU-SUN	Japanese Imperialism and the Open Door in China	428–431

II.—SUBJECTS

		Pages
AFRICA, SOUTH	A Threat to Ban the LABOUR MONTHLY in South Africa	535,662
AUSTRIA	General Strike and Uprising in Austria	145–152
	Austria and the Art of Insurrection	233–238
	Letter to the Austrian Workers	353–364
BOOK REVIEWS	The Condition of the Working Class in Britain. Allen Hutt	57–61
	Religion and Communism. Julius F. Hecker	61–62
	Memoirs of a Bolshevik. O. Piatnitsky	62–64
	Youth in Soviet Russia. Klaus Meinhert. Juvenile Unemployment. J. Jewkes and A. Winterbottom	127–128
	The Civil War in France. K. Marx	128
	Hitler over Europe. Ernst Henri	245–248
	William Morris, P. Bloomfield. William Morris, Montague Weekley	254–255
	The Tolpuddle Martyrs. M. Firth and A. Hopkinson	255
	Are You going to Russia ? Lars Moën	255–256
	B.U.F., Oswald Mosley and British Fascism. J. Drennan	314–317
	Austrian Democracy under Fire. Otto Bauer	318–319
	Driving Axle. V. Ilyenkov	319–320
	What Marx really Meant. G. D. H. Cole. Karl Marx: A Study in Fanaticism. E. H. Carr	432–439
	Fascism and Social Revolution. R. P. Dutt	440–443
	The Roosevelt Illusion. E. Burns and F. M. Roy. Will Roosevelt Succeed ? A. F. Brockway	444–446
	Reports and Decisions of 13th Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International	446–448
	Lenin on Britain. Introduction by Harry Pollitt	633–635
	Co-operation in the U.S.S.R. L. A. Paul	635–636
	Problems of the Socialist Transition. Sir S. Cripps, etc.	637

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

		Pages
	The First Workers' Government. G. R. Mitchison. A Guide to Modern Politics. G. D. H. and M. I. Cole	696–699
	Why War? E. Wilkinson and E. Conze. Merchants of Death. H. C. Engelbrecht and F. C. Hanighen	699–701
	The Outlook of Science. R. L. Worrall	701–704
	Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx. Sidney Hook	757–760
CHINA	China and the Policy of the Kuomintang	239–244
	Japanese Imperialism and the Open Door in China	428–431
CYPRUS	Terror in Cyprus	303–307
DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM	Dialectical Materialism and Communism—A Postscript 563–572,	692–695
	A Partial Exposure of Idealism	701–704
ENGINEERING	Speeding up Engineering To-day	287–294
FAR EAST	The Powder Magazine in the Far East	85–89
	Japanese Imperialism and the Open Door in China	428–431
FASCISM	Irish Labour Party and Fascism	48–52
	Whither 1934?	195–219
	The Struggle against Fascism	245–248
	Railways and the struggle against Fascism	295–302
	British Fascism	314–317
	The Anti-Fascist Front	387–402
	Meaning of the Sedition Bill	403–412
	The Anti-Fascist Front	583–596
	T.U.C., Labour Party and Fascism	599–606
	Prospects of the Anti-Fascist Struggle	607–612
	Progress of the Sedition Bill	613–620
	The Next Steps in the Fight against Fascism	728–734
FRANCE	Stavisky—a Portent	153–160
	Documents on the United Fronts in France 573–576,	621–626
GERMANY	June 30th and the Revolutionary Development in Germany	502–512
	New Political Perspectives in Germany	545–554
I.L.P.	Towards the I.L.P. Easter Conference: Trends in the I.L.P.	90–96
	The International Question	96–100
	The I.L.P. Choice	131–142
	The Conference of the I.L.P. and After	273–279
INDIA	The Background in India	173–177
	Struggle of the Indian Textile Workers	346–352
INTERNATIONAL SITUATION	After Ten Years	5–24
	Whither 1934?	195–219
	May-Day, 1934	259–272
	Now They Are Madmen	373–379
	New Issues	519–535
IRELAND	Irish Labour Party and Fascism	48–54
	Republican Congress and Ireland's Fight	686–691
	Agriculture and Industry in Ireland	744–748
JAPAN	Japanese Imperialism and the Open Door in China	428–431

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY	The Financial Position of the LABOUR MONTHLY	515–518
	The LABOUR MONTHLY Debt Fund and Guarantee Fund	579–582
	Our Financial Appeal	643–646, 705–707
	A Threat to ban the LABOUR MONTHLY in South Africa	535,662
LABOUR MOVEMENT	Features of the Labour Movement	32–35
	The Meaning of the New Unemployment Bill	36–43
	A Robbery of the Public	44–47
	Documents on the United Front in Britain	53–56
	From 1844—1934	57–61
	The National March and Congress	69–84
	Crisis and the Way Forward in Woollens	101–108
	Strike Struggles in Birmingham	109–113
	Marx and Engels on the British Working-Class Movement	120–126, 185–191, 249–253, 308–313, 380–384, 629–632 749–756
	Who Fights against Starvation	161–164
	Successes in the Scottish Miners' Struggles	165–172
	After the Congress of Action	220–224
	The Congress of Action and Youth in Industry	225–232
	May-Day, 1934	259–272
	Towards the Counter Offensive	280–287
	Speeding-Up in Engineering To-day	287–294
	Railways and the Struggle against Fascism	295–302
	The May-Day Strike at Lucas	341–345
	The Anti-Fascist Front	387–402
	The Hays Wharf Strike	413–417
	New Issues	519–535
	The Anti-Fascist Front	583–598
	The T.U.C., Labour Party and Fascism	599–606
	The United Front and the Labour Party	647–661
	The Fight for the United Front	711–727
LABOUR PARTY	The T.U.C., Labour Party and Fascism	599–606
	The United Front and the Labour Party	647–661
	The Labour Party Prepares for War	663–674
LENIN AND LENINISM	Lenin	25–31
	Features of the Labour Movement	32–35
	Lenin on Britain	633–635
MARX AND MARXISM	Marxism in Caricature	432–439
	Marx and Engels on the British Working-Class Movement. 1879 to 1895	120–126, 185–191, 249–253, 308–313, 380–384, 629–632 749–756
	Dialectical Materialism and Communism. postscript	563–572, 692–695
	Towards the Misunderstanding of Marx	757–760
MINING	Successes in the Scottish Miners' Struggle	165–172
MORRIS, WILLIAM	William Morris Versus the Morris Myth	178–184
	Morris Biographised	254–255

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

		Pages
NOTES OF THE MONTH	5–24, 69–84, 131–144, 195–219, 259–272, 325–340, 387–402, 451–464, 519–535, 583–598, 647–661, 711–727	
POETRY	The Test	144
RAILWAYS	Railways and the Struggle against Fascism	295–302
SEDITION BILL	Meaning of the Sedition Bill	403–412
	Progress of the Sedition Bill	613–620
SOCIALIST LEAGUE	Socialist League—What Next ?	675–679
	Politics of the Socialist League	696–699
SPAIN	Spanish Civil War	680–685
	Councils of Action in Spain	739–743
STRIKES	Strike Struggles in Birmingham	109–113
	May-Day Strike at Lucas	341–345
	Hays Wharf Strike	413–417
TRADES UNION CONGRESS	T.U.C. and the United Front	536–544
	The T.U.C., Labour Party and Fascism	599–606
TROTSKYISM	The Bankruptcy of Trotskyism	365–372
UNEMPLOYMENT	The Meaning of the New Unemployment Bill	36–43
	The National March and Congress	69–84
	Who Fights against Starvation ?	161–164
	After the Congress of Action	220–224
	The Congress of Action and Youth in Industry	225–232
UNITED FRONT	Documents on the United Front	53–56
	T.U.C. and the United Front	536–544
	Documents on the United Front : France	573–576
	Documents on the United Front in France and Italy	621–626
	United Front and the Labour Party	647–661
	The Fight for the United Front	711–727
U.S.A.	American Farmers Ride into Action	114–119
	The " New Deal " Swindle	418–427
	Two Views of Roosevelt	444–446
WAR	The Powder Magazine in the Far East	85–89
	The Race to War	325–340
	The Fight Against War	451–464
	A Questionnaire on War 465–487, 555–562,	627–628
	1914 and 1934	488–496
	War from the Air	497–501
	The War Question and the Labour Party	597–598
	War and the Fighting Instinct	627–628
	Labour Party Prepares for War	663–674
	How Not to Fight War	699–701
WOOLLEN INDUSTRY	Crisis and the Way Forward in Woollens	101–108
WORLD OF LABOUR	53–56, 573–576,	621–626
YOUTH	A Robbery of the Public	44–47
	The Youth in Two Worlds	127–128
	The Congress of Action and Youth in Industry	225–232
	Muzzling the League of Youth	635–638

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEBT FUND

To the Manager,
THE LABOUR MONTHLY,
7 John Street,
London, W.C.1.

Date.....

In response to your appeal I enclose herewith the sum of .....*as a contribution to the* LABOUR MONTHLY *Debt Fund.*

Name .....

Address .....

.....

GUARANTEE FUND

To the Manager,
THE LABOUR MONTHLY,
7 John Street,
London, W.C.1.

Date.....

I promise to send the sum of .....*monthly to the* LABOUR MONTHLY *Guarantee Fund until further notice and enclose herewith a first instalment of*.....

Name .....

Address .....

.....

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DAILY INFORMATION

is essential in the present epoch of wars and revolutions

ESSENTIAL INFORMATION OF THE CLASS WAR CAN ONLY BE FOUND DAILY IN THE

DAILY WORKER

7d. per week, post free

41 TABERNACLE STREET, LONDON, E.C. 2

THE
LABOUR
MONTHLY

Volume 16 October, 1934 Number 10

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Notes of the Month By R.P.D.
The Anti-Fascist Front

The T.U.C., Labour Party and Fascism
By J. Shields

The Prospects of the Anti-Fascist Struggle
By John Strachey

The Progress of the Sedition Bill
By Ronald Kidd

War and the Fighting Instinct
By Havelock Ellis

Marx and Engels on the British Working Class Movement, 1879-1895—IX

Book Reviews and World of Labour

THE
LABOUR
MONTHLY

Volume 16 November, 1934 Number 11

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Notes of the Month By R.P.D.
The United Front and the Labour Party

The Labour Party prepares for War
By R. F. Andrews

The Socialist League. What next?
By William Rust

The Spanish Civil War
By R. Page Arnot

The Republican Congress and Ireland's Fight By J. Shields

Book Reviews
Politics of the Socialist League
By R.P.D.

etc., etc.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOVIET RUSSIA FIGHTS CRIME

By Lenka von Koerber

Illustrated. **10s. 6d.** net.

The author was given free access to the prisons of the U.S.S.R. Her detailed objective account shows that the Soviet Penal system, with its "daring" humanity, is a brilliantly successful contrast to bourgeois methods.

SOVIET RUSSIA FIGHTS NEUROSIS

By F. E. Williams, M.D.

7s. 6d. net.

A psychiatrist looks at the U.S.S.R and finds that Soviet mental hygiene is rapidly solving the problem of neurosis by creating the conditions of health and security.

ROUTLEDGE

IT becomes more and more difficult for busy men and women to keep a finger on the pulse of political happenings, at home and abroad; to select from the deluge of new books those that are really worth reading; to choose the plays, films and exhibitions worth seeing or the music worth hearing.

In the midst of a confused, conflicting and "inspired" press, the "plain man" feels the need for plain words and sane thinking.

THE NEW STATESMAN AND NATION, which now incorporates the WEEK-END REVIEW, has a world-wide reputation for foresight, knowledge and fearless independence. With refreshing lucidity it sets before its readers the essential news of the week and the constructive thoughts of some of the ablest brains in the country.

Its reviews of new books, remarkable for their detachment and authority, have made the paper the leading medium of its class for publishers' announcements.

There are many other regular features in the paper, including competitions, which the limitations of space prevent us from mentioning here, but we will be pleased to send you a free specimen copy upon request and mention of this magazine.

THE NEW STATESMAN AND NATION

Fridays **The Week-end Review** Sixpence

A Postal Subscription, to any address in the world, costs 30s. per annum

10 GREAT TURNSTILE, LONDON, W.C. 1

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WE ARE BUILDERS

In these days of economic stress the foundations of many old-established businesses are in danger. These should be strengthened by the latest known and proved methods.

New businesses need special care in building, concrete is largely used—the outcome of science and experience.

High-class Publicity and Printing is the best form of concrete foundation to any business or Association.

WE ARE BUILDERS

LEICESTER
CO-OPERATIVE
PRINTING
SOCIETY LIMITED
Church Gate, Leicester
LONDON: 58 Gough St., W.C.1

Published by the Proprietors, the Trinity Trust, 7 John Street, W.C.1, and Printed by the Leicester Co-operative Printing Society Limited, 99 Church Gate, Leicester

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED